FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-108-S
Tuesday
6 June 1990

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-89-108-S 5 June 1990

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Military

Yakovlev Open Phone Line Planned 7 May *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 May]* 1
Polozkov Interviewed on Soviet Army, Economy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 May]* 1

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia Issues Declaration on Lithuania *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 4 Apr]* 3
Estonian Communist Leaders Appeal to Party *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 8 Apr]* 3
Estonian Party Coalition Structure Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 8 Apr]* 4
Estonian Military Conference Views Spring Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Apr]* 5
Russians in Estonia Defend Army, Rights *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 16 Mar]* 6
Victory Day Observance in Estonia Deplored *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 10 May]* 8
New Latvian Central Committee Members Announced *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 10 Apr]* 9
Latvian Party Congress Financial Report Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 10 Apr]* 11
Sobolev Delivers Speech at Latvian Party Congress *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 10 Apr]* 14
Political Outlook for Latvia Examined *[TRUD 29 Apr]* 15
Latvians Report on Meeting With Gorbachev *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 20 Apr]* 17
29 April Latvian Election Winners Listed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 1 May]* 18
Lenin Cited on 'Tolerance' for Lithuania *[Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 26 Apr]* 19
Lithuanian Supreme Council Structure Established *[EKHO LITVY 7 Apr]* 20
Lithuanian Party Leader Appeals For Unity *[EKHO LITVY 7 Apr]* 20
Supreme Council Issues Appeal to Youth on Draft *[EKHO LITVY 6 Apr]* 22
Landsbergis Cited on Possible Military Coup *[EKHO LITVY 6 Apr]* 22
Landsbergis Writes Gorbachev on Draft *[EKHO LITVY 24 Apr]* 22
Prunskiene Addresses Council on Government Plans *[EKHO LITVY 13 Apr]* 23
Independent Lithuanian Party Declaration *[EKHO LITVY 28 Apr]* 25

RSFSR

Kuleshov Elected Head of Altay Kraykom *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Apr]* 25
RSFSR Trade Union Federation Plenum Held *[TRUD 25 Apr]* 26
Republican People's Party of Russia Formed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 25 Apr]* 26
Russian Christian Democratic Movement Named *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 25 Apr]* 26
Russian Self-Defense in Republics Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Apr]* 27
First RSFSR Deputies Congress Discussed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Apr]* 29
Moscow Deputies Form Democratic Russia Bloc *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 9 Apr]* 34
First Session of Leningrad Oblast Soviet Held *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 35
More on Session *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 36
Session Ends *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 37
Deputies View Session *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 38
New Leningrad Oblast Soviet Chief Profiled *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 39
New Leningrad Oblast Chairman Profiled *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 40
Leningrad City Soviet First Session Viewed *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 41
Session Continues *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 42
Deputies View New City Soviet *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 43
Leningrad Deputies Discuss Tasks of Soviet *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 44

Comments on Session *[LENINGRADSKYA PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 45
Medvedev Meets With Leningrad Workers 17 Apr *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 46
Selection of Rayon Envoys to CPSU Congress *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 49
New Moscow Soviet Session Continues *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 50
Appeal of Moscow Party Secretaries Group Published *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 51
Commission Meets on Repeat Election of Deputies *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Apr]* 52
Repeat Election Results *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Apr]* 52
Election Official Discusses Delegate Selection *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Apr]* 53
Moscow Roundtable Discusses Draft Party Rules *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 55
Luzhkov Elected Mossovet Ispolkom Chairman *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 27 Apr]* 59
Gidaspov Delivers Report to Leningrad Conference *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 60
Deputies Discuss Work of Moscow Soviet *[VECHERNAYA MOSKVA 26 Apr]* 71
Leningrad Joint Party Conference Speeches Given *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 72
Prokofyev Comments on Moscow Party Congress *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 83
Leningrad Oblast 19 Apr Election Results Reviewed *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 88
Speeches at Leningrad Joint Party Conference *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 89
Leningrad Party Conference Holds Elections *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 92

Western Republics

Belorussian People's Front Hold Mass Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 28 Feb]* 94
Belorussian Leadership Changes Announced *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 8 Apr]* 95
Belorussia's Sokolov Views Current Party Tasks *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 18 Apr]* 95
Moldavian Resolution on Congress Date Published *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 7 Mar]* 99
Ivashko Reads Note From Works Party Secretary *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Feb]* 99
Ivashko Speaks at Donetsk Oblast Party Conference *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 10 Apr]* 100
Ivashko Tours Donetsk Oblast on Visit *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 10 Apr]* 102
Resolution on Ukrainian Election of Delegates *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 4 Apr]* 102
Charges Filed in March Pro-Lithuania Rally *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 8 Apr]* 103

Caucasus

Article Urges Formation of Transcaucasian Council *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 16 Mar]* 105
Georgian Communist Party Announces Personnel Changes *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 4 Apr]* 107
Georgian Supreme Soviet on Protecting Sovereignty *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 12 Mar]* 107
Georgian Journalist Union Declares Independence *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 23 Mar]* 108

Military

Yakovlev Open Phone Line Planned 7 May

WA1605190690 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "An Invitation To Converse"]

[Text] Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev served in the Soviet Army from 1941 to 1943. He participated in the fighting on the Volga Front and was a platoon leader in the 6th Separate Marine Brigade. He was discharged to the reserves after being seriously wounded.

Beginning in 1946 he became engaged in party work and journalism, and worked a long time in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. Over the period 1973-1983, he served as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in Canada, then as director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He is a doctor of historical sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Beginning in July 1985 he again worked in the CPSU Central Committee, and from March 1986—as CPSU Central Committee secretary. He is a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on International Policy. He was appointed a member of the USSR Presidential Council in March of this year.

On the eve of the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory, A.N. Yakovlev will respond to the questions of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers over an open phone line. He will be awaiting your calls on 7 May from 10 to 12 o'clock, Moscow time. Telephone number: 941-24-40.

Polozkov Interviewed on Soviet Army, Economy

PM3105112990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with I.K. Polozkov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy and candidate for RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairmanship: "Interview in St. George's Hall. I.K. Polozkov: We Live in One Russia"—conducted by own parliamentary correspondents Captain First Rank V. Lukashevich, Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev, and Capatin Third Rank V. Urban on28 May]

[Text] Taking advantage of the break when deputies were passing time before the vote was taken, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA parliamentary correspondents asked I.K. Polozkov, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy, to answer a few questions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] In your program there is a passage which is devoted to the Armed Forces and their problems. In particular you condemn unjustified attacks on the Army and favor the earliest possible solution of the social issues which are confronting servicemen. Could you enlarge on this?

[Polozkov] I came across the Armed Forces' problems during the election campaign. I visited many military units, met officers' families, visited their apartments, sometimes in remote areas, and I saw how the military live in field conditions. And I must say that they live very, very badly—and that is putting it mildly. We absolutely must give some thought to these questions. Older people will remember how after the war, and even during the fifties our girls regarded it as their good fortune to marry an officer. And they were right. The word "officer" had a proud ring, and this is how it had always been from time immemorial. Not just during the Soviet period but even before the revolution. This was a social stratum of the population whose prestige was supported by the state and by society. Today it is being degraded, and this worries me. You will agree, no matter what an army it is, an army is an army. It is a specific service. These are people who are ready to sacrifice themselves for the defense of the motherland. Let us proceed in the light of this. This does not apply just to the Armed Forces but also to the border guards and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] troops. Today a regiment commander's pay is considerably lower than that of a collective farm team leader. Is this a good or a bad thing? I believe that this is very bad. Then there is the problem of the lack of kindergartens and creches for children from servicemen's families, they have simply nowhere to put them. How do the women who have thrown in their lot with the Army manage? And there is a multitude of other problems. Sometimes the military lack even the most elementary things necessary to get on with life. And that is not to mention housing. All this has convinced me that this category of people have simply been forgotten in our country. Behind the general deliberations that too much money is being spent on defense, and that this is ruining us, about which much is being written at the moment, we have forgotten that behind the Army there are specific, real people.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Among the telegrams which have arrived addressed to you there is the following one: "We support Polozkov and demand that disarmament be stopped forthwith." What can you say on this score, Ivan Kuzmich?

[Polozkov] This telegram was clearly dictated by the sentiments of a specific person. Perhaps a veteran. Back home in Krasnodar there are many pensioners and retired military. They are a special section of the population. As for disarmament, my attitude toward it is perfectly normal. I take the view that it is a sensible process and that we must seek it. Second, the weapon stockpiles represent a great burden not just for our people but also for the other peoples of the world. And third, disarmament could help our country to resolve many social and economic problems. Therefore my

attitude toward disarmament is entirely positive. However, we are living in an alarming world today and, unfortunately, the solution of this question does not depend on us alone.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There is a lot of talk about conversion at the moment. Do you agree with the way it is being conducted?

[Polozkov] Conversion is a good thing. However, I believe that we must take care not to convert the military industry to such an extent as to lose its scientific and technical, and especially its intellectual potential. After all, whether we like it or not, our best designers and engineers are concentrated in the defense sectors of industry. And also the best technologies. Therefore it would be a good thing if all this were to be channeled not into the production of some output of secondary importance but into the medical industry, for instance, or the equipment of our scientific research and sectorial institutes and higher educational establishment laboratories so as to boost scientific and technical progress in various sectors of the national economy. This would be very useful. Losing this potential which took years to build up is unwise.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Ivan Kuzmich, the new government program is currently being discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. What is your attitude to the term "socialist market?"

[Polozkov] I still have no idea what is meant by a regulated market. The fact that we need to switch to the market is not in any doubt. We simply have no choice. Incidentally, as long as 15 years ago I personally expressed indignation at the fact that our economic principles are largely constricting and do not allow a spirit of enterprise and independence to develop. So, this question is not new. However, we are not yet ready for a switch to a market economy. The overwhelming majority of production collective managers in our country are not ready for supply-and-demand operations. So far we have not thought about these questions, no one has taught us how to handle them. And most importantly, our people are not ready for the market either. Most of the country's people live on low incomes, they are afraid of price rises, of abrupt changes in their lives, they are psychologically unprepared. After all, many people, living on a small pension or low wages, or a student grant, have gotten used to getting up in the morning and going out and buying a bottle of kefir. Our whole way of life, our thinking has to be changed. In order to do this it is necessary to run experiments involving certain categories of goods which will not radically affect the bulk of the population, that is the aforementioned pensioners, students, and other low-income strata who live on fixed income. They have to be protected.

Baltic Republics

Estonia Issues Declaration on Lithuania

90UN1445C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 3

[Declaration of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet: "On the Restoration of the Independence of the Republic of Lithuania"]

[Text] Expressing the will of the people of Lithuania, on 11 March 1990 the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet passed an act on the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania.

The Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] respects the will of the Lithuanian people and is convinced that its implementation of that will is not an internal matter for the USSR, but rather an issue of an international character. Like the other Baltic states, Lithuania did not join the USSR but was bound to it forcibly as the result of occupation. Therefore the restoration of freedom for either Lithuania or the other Baltic states does not and cannot proceed from the application of Article 72 of the USSR Constitution on secession from the USSR, but can be based only on international law.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet believes that the relations of the Republic of Lithuania with the USSR, like those of the other Baltic States, can be legitimately defined only through negotiations on a basis of equality which takes into consideration the sovereignty, legal interests, and rights of both parties without stipulating conditions in advance. We call upon the president of the USSR to take immediate steps to begin such negotiations with the Republic of Lithuania. For the success of these negotiations it is necessary to stop immediately the military pressure on the part of the USSR and the political provocations whose goal is to force the people of Lithuania to repudiate their desire for independence and to perpetuate the occupation of the Republic of Lithuania.

In this difficult time for the people of Lithuania, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet expresses full support for their aspirations, highly values their courage, and expresses its acknowledgement of the independent statehood of Lithuania. Estonia is ready for comprehensive cooperation with the Republic of Lithuania.
Tallinn, 3 April 1990.

Estonian Communist Leaders Appeal to Party

90UN1601A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 2

["Appeal to the Estonian Communist Party"]

[Text] The complex political processes of present-day Estonia and a situation where many people are finding it difficult to get their bearings in the various public movements and evaluations force us to address all communists and express our opinion and positions. Many people are currently asking: How can we ensure Estonia's balanced development in the direction of state independence.

The vast majority of inhabitants of Estonia understands today that we can only achieve this goal through a peaceful policy in cooperation with all public groups. Just as it is clear that a sound home cannot be built on sand, so it is that the Estonia of the future cannot be built without a strong political, economic, and social base.

Two main political events in Estonia whose influence we cannot yet, possibly, recognize in full are the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress and the first session of the new Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and the decisions it adopted.

We were faced at the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress with a dilemma: Either we could attract other national groups to the side of an independent Estonia or we would lose hope of the parliamentary and peaceful restoration of independence. We believe that this is not just the communists' problem. We found a balance to some extent between Estonians' aspiration to independence and the non-Estonian population's need to obtain firm social assurances. In the transitional period the Estonian Communist Party must ensure this consensus.

The formation of an independent party of the like-minded, with its sure place in the social system of Estonia and defending Marxist ideals and those common to all mankind and also a search for ideological allies—this is a task of more than just a single day. The Estonian Communist Party must be a party which fully assures intra-party democracy and the possibility of the participation of all its members in the shaping of party policy and tactics. We are open to cooperation with all other democratic movements of Estonia. We consider it important to use the spiritual potential and material resources of the Estonian Communist Party to extricate Estonia from the socioeconomic crisis and to form a genuinely democratic political system precluding the monopoly of any party whatever. As a democratic parliamentary party, our goal is the pursuit of a balanced policy taking account of political reality and the interests of all national groups. There cannot be independence based on political recklessness and simple solutions, just as there cannot be a new Estonia denying the interests of this national group or the other.

The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress proceeded from the clear understanding that the achievement of Estonia's state independence is a process at each step of which account must be taken of the interests of all participants. The new Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, democratically elected by the people, has begun work. It is perfectly clear that a group of deputies with different interests and varying political experience needs time to cultivate a parliamentary style of work. We lack such experience. For this reason the work of the deputies and

the work of the government should be treated with respect and trust. We need to give them time for composed activity.

The new Supreme Soviet has adopted a number of serious documents, which were born in a clash of various forces. Ultimately the political importance of each document will be determined by how clearly and accurately it expresses the cherished aspirations of the people. It must be clear both to those who support it and those who reject it. In this connection we cannot overlook certain provisions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet decree of 30 March "The Official Status of the Estonian SSR."

The situation in Estonia may really be considered movement toward independence, as of 16 November 1988, what is more. The said decree defines the ultimate goal of the transitional period. However, the actual content of this period is not revealed.

Questions arise in connection with the use of the concept "occupation." To resolve such complex problems should we not appeal to some authoritative international legal authority to obtain an impartial constitutional evaluation of Estonia's present position? If we proceed from the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet decree of 12 November 1989, "Historical and Legal Evaluation of the Events Which Occurred in Estonia in 1940," it has to be acknowledged that the organs of power and administration of the Estonian SSR continue to operate under conditions of continued annexation. Would it be correct from the standpoint of constitutional law to speak of continuing occupation? After all, organs of military occupation authorities are lacking here, and representatives of Estonia have been elected to the organs of power of an "occupying state." Let us ask ourselves: Would it be more effective to exercise our aspirations to statehood if we consider the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet the organ of occupation authorities, and the soldiers and officers of various nationalities performing their compulsory service in the Soviet Army on our soil, occupiers?

The agreements of the great powers on arms reductions open the way to the demilitarization of Estonia. Stages on this path are the presence of military units of the Soviet Army in Estonia on a firm treaty basis and their withdrawal from Estonia given the loss of strategic necessity. There shows through here also a connection with an issue which is painful for all of us—regulation of relations between young Estonian conscripts and the Soviet Army. Availing themselves of their opportunities, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and, together with it, the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee also should find an acceptable solution at the highest level of the USSR and the Soviet Army. In Estonia, on the other hand, it is essential to begin consultations between the departments concerned and the main political movements.

We have in social development reached a point where progressing further merely on the wave of appeals and mass meetings is impossible. Practical work for the good of the motherland is expected of us. For such sentiments to strengthen civil peace and cooperation, calm and the businesslike solution of all problems are essential.
[Signed] V. VYALYAS, chairman of the Estonian Communist Party.
E.-A. SILLARI, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

Estonian Party Coalition Structure Viewed

90UN1601B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 2

[Commentary by V. Malkovskiy, Yu. Tolmachev and N. Zakharov: "What Is the Coalition Central Committee?"]

[Text] **On 6 April SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA published the appeal of a group of members of the Estonian Communist Party Coalition Central Committee to all members of the Estonian Communist Party sharing the standpoint of ideological and organizational ties to the CPSU. Today V. Malkovskiy, Yu. Tolmachev and N. Zakharov comment on this appeal.**

We began our appeal, as the readers obviously remember, as follows: "The processes of the qualitative renewal of our party are proving painful and ambivalent." And this is indeed the case. Everyone surely knows how dramatic the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress was and how acute the clashes were there of different positions, viewpoints, and opinions.

Visiting the party organizations now and listening closely to the numerous questions which are being asked by the communists, we can see that not everyone has altogether wholly understood **what**essentially occurred at the party congress, the more so in that utterly varying information in this connection is appearing in the Union press even. From here also come the varying interpretations here in the republic and, frequently, disagreements between communists emanating precisely from a varying understanding of the situation. But a varying understanding leads to varying actions also....

It is often asked whether an independent Estonian Communist Party has begun to operate in Estonia from the time of the congress, having detached itself from CPSU.

Let us ponder. Essentially **the ideological basis** and prerequisites for the structuring of such a party have now been created. It could take shape organizationally, on the other hand, after its congress. As you know, it is contemplated holding this congress in the fall. And certain statements giving a somewhat different interpretation of this question essentially lack realistic grounds as yet. Until the fall, more precisely until October, the entire Estonian Communist Party is organizationally a part of the CPSU. In other words, Estonia **has not repeated** the Lithuanian version. There, after all, the congress declared its withdrawal from the CPSU, which was essentially in breach of the rules inasmuch as collective

withdrawal from the party is not legitimate. This question can and should be decided by each communist for himself only individually. It is such a decision which the communists have to make within the transitional period which was announced by our congress. But it is a question of more than just this. Extensive discussion is altogether under way in the party currently. A big influence on the processes occurring in the communist parties of all republics will evidently be exerted by the 28th Congress, direct some things into a new channel and force some things, possibly, to be reassessed anew. This has to be taken into consideration.

An entirely new and exceptional organ of leadership of party life has at this time taken shape in the Estonian Communist Party—the Coalition Central Committee. Many people are obviously not entirely clear about what this is. It should be said right away that so much that is new is now happening in general that not everything may be approached with the old yardsticks and old ideas. In the complex, transitional period in the life of the party (transitional not only in the Estonian Communist Party but throughout the party inasmuch, as we all understand, changes have to and will occur), in this complex period we are, naturally, seeking new forms of work too.

What distinguishes the Coalition Central Committee and how is it organizing its work?

The point of it is that currently, at this stage, such a form of work of the leadership makes it possible for two different "factions," so to speak, to operate within the party, legalizes them and at the same time affords opportunities for cooperation, many questions being decided jointly.

Speaking about the Coalition Central Committee, some communists are starting to add up how many there are of "ours" and "not ours." We should say right away that this is of no great significance. The Coalition Central Committee consists, essentially, of two parts, not to say "factions," and each adopts its own decisions, so to speak, subsequently familiarizing the other part with them. On certain issues there could be different positions. And they remain different. We, for instance, had our own fundamental opinion in connection with the decree adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet on the official status of Estonia. And we expressed this in a statement, also published in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, which supported the decisions of the city soviets of Sillamyaye, Kokhtlya-Yarve, and Narva concerning a suspension of this decree on their territory.

But some questions we decide **together,** and our positions are identical. At the last Central Committee plenum, for example, both "factions" had, generally, an identical opinion on problems of the broadening of the independence of the primary party organizations, the transferring of membership dues, and the organization of the party's management and economic activity.

There is cooperation at secretary level also. Although, once again, the secretaries heading the different "factions" could in some instances have different opinions and realize them in particular decisions.

In our opinion, incidentally, it is not under present conditions necessary to form a Central Committee Bureau. The Coalition Central Committee is small, and for this reason it can be flexible and assemble at any moment, as the situation demands.

And one further thought. If there is actually something essential dividing us—this is basically the attitude toward the program adopted by the 20th Congress—why do we consider it necessary to be a part of a Coalition Central Committee? First, and we would like to emphasize this once again, this affords an opportunity to **cooperate** on some important positions, which under the complex conditions of the confrontation of different political forces, of the right included, would seem necessary. And, second, the absence of our group or "faction" from the Central Committee would complicate to a considerable extent the activity of the party organizations adhering to positions of unity with the CPSU and operating in the cities and rayons where a majority of the communists supports the Estonian Communist Party Program. It was with good reason that the statement of the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress emphasized that the members of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee who represent in the Central Committee party organizations which did not support the Estonian Communist Party Program at the congress would, in the transitional period, lead the activity of these party organizations and represent their interests. It is this—representing interests—that we see as a our principal function.

The complex situation in the Estonian Communist Party has evidently caused in some communists a certain confusion and misunderstanding and nonacceptance even. It is known that some communists are expressing the intention of suspending their party activity until the 28th Congress. This, we believe, is wrong. On the contrary, the high assertiveness of the communists is particularly important now. After all, it will depend on all of us essentially **how** events will continue to develop in the party. It is now that we need to bring together all that is progressive and most promising and on this basis formulate the corresponding proposals and find ways of solving problems both within the CPSU as a whole and here in the Estonian Communist Party.

Estonian Military Conference Views Spring Draft

PM2804191190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel A. Yurkin report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "When Should I Desert and Should I Take My Gun With Me?"]

[Text] Tallinn, 27 Apr—As is well known, the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet quite

recently adopted a law on service by the republic's inhabitants in the USSR Armed Forces.

Estonia's legislators are rescinding the legal norms stipulating responsibility for refusing or avoiding military service or training conferences and violating the rules of military registration. Everyone called to account for such actions has been rehabilitated. At the same time, the participation of institutions, enterprises, and organizations in the draft campaign is deemed incompatible with the state status of the Estonian SSR, and they have been instructed to "cease this activity."

After this law was adopted, attacks on the USSR Armed Forces in the republic's mass media intensified. Anti-army movements stepped up their activity, too. One of them—Geneva-49—headed by J. Lijma, a deputy of the republic's parliament, is particularly vigorous in its defamation of the Soviet Army. The leader of Geneva-49 has personal scores to settle with the military. At one time this man—an extended-service soldier without even secondary education—was discharged into the reserve for improper conduct. Now he, past the age of 50, is teaching young Estonians to burn their draft cards and refuse army service.

The political games of the old are leaving their imprint on the young. As M. Pedak, an adviser to the republic's government, admits, approximately 2,000 young people are already petitioning to be assigned to alternative service. The Tallinn City Soviet has even organized a special commission for compulsory labor, declaring that the republic's Supreme Soviet assumes full responsibility for the youngsters' fate. That is why these draftees, confused by their statesmen, are having to resolve an issue containing a great many unknown quantities. On the one hand, there is the USSR Constitution, which hasn't been abolished by anyone, and on the other there are local laws and the chorus of different voices claiming that service in the "army of occupation" is immoral.

"There are 84 fugitives in our republic," Colonel V. Fedyrko, Estonian SSR deputy military commissar, said. "Seven of them have returned to their units with the help of their families and the prosecutor's office."

At the Military Commissariat they have a letter sent by some worried Estonian parents. Their son asks when to desert and should he take his automatic rifle with him. That assault trooper's letter should give many people food for thought.

On 26 April, delegates to the Estonian SSR Military Commissariat party conference sent a message to M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR. The report of Colonel N. Redko, chief of the republic Military Commissariat's Political Directorate, and the speeches noted that in the prevailing situation, in which the USSR Constitution and USSR Laws have virtually ceased to operate on Estonian territory and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet is adopting laws aimed against them, the spring military draft is in danger of being disrupted and the system of mobilization work has been violated.

Concerned by the present situation, the party conference delegates adopted the message to the USSR President asking that specific measures be taken to ensure the conditions necessary for the work of military commissariats in the republic.

Russians in Estonia Defend Army, Rights

90UN1545A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 4

[Article by V. Repetskiy: "To Live Together and Understand Each Other"]

[Text] As we have already reported, a republic rally under the slogan "For restoring civil rights and the unity of the USSR" was held in Tallinn, Kohtla-Jarve, Narva, and Sillamae on 14 March.

Our report is about the rally on Freedom Square in Tallinn.

What brought here thousands of people of the most diverse professions and ages, people subscribing to different, sometimes opposite, ideological and political views?

First of all, the still growing concern of a considerable segment of the so-called Russian-speaking populace about not only their future but also the present, uneasiness caused by the political events underway and those that are easy to predict both inside the republic and in its mutual relations with the USSR.

A year ago to the day, the first mass rally was held at which they expressed their protest against some legislative acts adopted by the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and voiced their determination to fight for their constitutional rights. However, as stressed at the beginning of the rally, the events which have happened during this year have not only failed to reduce tension but have also exacerbated it. This is why a decision was announced to proclaim 14 March the day of struggle for the restoration of civil rights and the unity of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We do not set the task of assessing the rally and commenting on the speakers. We are sure that in our enlightened age the readers will figure out the situation themselves. This is why we will restrict ourselves to publishing the most essential excerpts from the speeches.

V. Yarovoy, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power and Civil Rights in Estonia.

Our committee was created for a reason. Those who sought to declare that the republic is to become independent now and envisage its further existence outside the Soviet Union prompted us to do so. Our committee has been supported by 157 enterprises and organizations in the republic; we have been supported by a number of enterprises of Moscow, Leningrad, and other union republics. Today, we received a telegram of support on

behalf of two million war and labor veterans from Belorussia which was also sent to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the CPSU Central Committee. Drawing on the support of many enterprises and organizations of the republic, the city soviets of Narva, Kohtla-Jarve, and Sillamae, our committee created on the night of 2-3 February believes that it is fully entitled to defend the interests of those who have placed their confidence in it.

Recently a notorious congress was held in our republic. I am told that many people listened to the broadcast from this congress with pain in their hearts and heart medicines at the ready. It is a great pity that the common people of Estonia, the workers and peasants of Estonia whom we sincerely respect and whom we trust, have now been cheated by a bunch of leaders. Now they are grabbing for power by playing up ethnic feelings, the most sensitive and sacred ones. As little as one-and-a-half to two years ago, these people claimed to be the ideologists of perestroyka. However, we can see where they have taken the republic by now.

The day which we foresaw a year and a half ago has come. At the time, we called on all people to be reasonable, appealed to the leadership of the republic with requests to listen to us. Unfortunately this has not happened.

Perhaps, by now few people are left who are hesitant and are asking themselves what at present are purely rhetorical questions: "Where are we going to and how?" Everything has become clear and understandable. I call on you to display greater vigor in the defense of your civil rights from this day forward.

For my part, I declare on behalf of the committee that we are switching to more vigorous actions and discontinuing the policy of concessions. I call on you to express your full support for the committee in this matter.

A. Say, candidate deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet (city of Tartu).

Trouble has visited our home. We are standing on the brink of an abyss on the eve of a sociopolitical and economic catastrophe.

At present, the "fighters for the freedom of Estonia" are trying to make a comeback under the banner of perestroyka. Frank appeals for it were heard at the Congress of the Citizens of Estonia. All of this was broadcast on Estonian Television.

"The forest brothers" and "ernovtsy" are now being glorified, and memorials to them are being built. At the same time, local authorities are depriving the veterans of a war against fascism of a minimal amount of services.

Today's politicians exhibit the same anti-Sovietism and exploitation of the ethnic feelings of the people, the same claim to a great mission of Estonia in relations between East and West.

Now is the time for all of us to ask ourselves whether we are prepared to bring back and enrich the avaricious Estonian and foreign bourgeoisie through our own labor. Are we prepared to knock on the doors of employment agencies? Are we prepared to give up the sociocultural, political, and other accomplishments which are already available or are planned for the future in the environment of renewed socialism? Do we desire to destroy yet again the powerful industry of Estonia created through the labor and sacrifices of the entire multinational union? I am sure that this does not suit or agree with all reasonable working people of any nationality. This is why I invite all those who share this view to unite. We find strength in unity only. [begin bold] L. Polishchuk, member of the Committee of the Working Women of Estonia. ((end bold))

We have come here in order to express our solidarity in the struggle against the legalized lack of rights, humiliation, insults, and infringements upon the Russian-speaking populace. Slandering and casting slurs upon the Soviet Army and the militia has become an instrument of state policy in our republic.

This entire anti-Soviet campaign is carried out in keeping with a single script. They need the power of the bourgeoisie whereas we need the power of the soviets, of the elected representatives of the people. If the Government of Estonia does not wish to reflect the interests of the Russian-speaking segment of the populace, we will elect the worthy ones from among ourselves and entrust them with defending our rights.

N. Aksinin, candidate deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Please note the building of the city executive committee. At present, it does not carry either the Order of Lenin or the Order of the Patriotic War. I view this as the continuation of a policy of neglecting not only the orders but also the people distinguished by them.

The entire country is preparing to celebrate solemnly the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory. The Tallinn City Soviet approached this in a peculiar manner, having adopted on 5 March a resolution "On Preferential Trade Services." Pursuant to this document, handicapped veterans of the Great Patriotic War, party and war veterans, and the widows of those who died are deprived of preferences. We should demand that the city authorities rescind this inhumane resolution.

With the complete connivance of the law-enforcement organs, "Geneva-49", which urges the criminal evasion of constitutional duty—service in the armed forces—by the young people, has mounted vigorous operations. Its operations, as well as the decision of the city soviet "On the Law on Comprehensive Military Service Duty" dated 30 January of this year, do not only harm the Armed Forces but also corrupt the morals of the young people.

I am certain that neglecting the memory of the dead, ignoring the interests of veteran soldiers, and antipatriotic and anti-internationalist slogans will bring about heavy moral losses for both the republic leadership and the local authorities.

V. Yermolayev, secretary of the party committee of the Production Association Estrybprom.

After the Congress of Estonia, it became clear that there are forces in the republic, and considerable forces at that, which are not even inclined to take into account either our interests or the reality of the day. Moreover, appeals by those who have voted for the Congress not to participate in elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet have already been heard. The following question is in order—where is a way out? What is to be done next?

There is only one answer: We will live together anyway, whether some people like it or not, and live with respect for each other.

We are confident that the newly elected Supreme Soviet of the republic will become an organ of power which is responsive to the desires and hopes of all workers of Estonia. This is why I appeal: "Everyone votes in the elections! Let us elect to the Supreme Soviet only the worthy representative of the people!"

V. Bezrukov, officer.

The campaign of pressuring the army and squeezing it out of Estonia began long ago and has proceeded along many avenues. Wholesale criticism of the army in the mass media which fades into unqualified slander creates a distorted perception of the Armed Services among the populace and encourages evading the service. Often it is not criticism but rather foul words and insults. This is exemplified by a resolution on the occupation troops adopted at the congress.

At present, the struggle for independence and sovereignty is directed against the people wearing military uniforms and their families. Thus, ecological rallies organized in Parnu, Haapsalu, and Tapa were anti-Soviet and anti-army in nature. Housing built with the funds of army units is not being allocated, and on 2 February, the Independence Day of Estonia, the Tallinn City Soviet published a ban on all construction and residence permits in the city.

From the very beginning, we attempted to remain neutral in the course of the unfolding struggle, but we can no longer remain silent. We cannot but be concerned about the future of our country, the Russian-speaking minority of the republic, and our own future. We are with you.

I. Shepelevich, member of the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power and Civil Rights in Estonia.

Hysterical screams about terrible occupiers are a dirty propaganda device for intimidating those who will have to do menial work tomorrow for their latter-day masters. Nobody wants to tell the Estonian people the truth: that thousands of the so-called patriot politicians who contribute nothing to the budget of Estonia and instead are hangers-on are maintained at the expense of their labor and that of the notorious "occupiers." They are grabbing for power in order to live at the expense of others, and the true colors of these people are showing even now in the course of this fight for power. They pursue a policy which brings about an undesirable negative attitude toward Estonia on the part of millions of people in our country by continuously exacerbating relations with the central organs and facilitating insulting attacks against the Russian-speaking populace.

We warned about many planks of the IME [Self-Managing Estonia] being unrealistic and about the failure of ill-conceived economic decisions. We asked to explain to the people in advance who was going to be responsible for this. At present, we once again get to hear generalized criticism of the center but not the recognition of their own unsoundness and their own mistakes for which the people will have to pay.

At present, the Russian-speaking community is "going through the motions" in its best tradition. Many people are waiting it out and putting their faith in common sense. However, it is time to understand that our future is in our hands, and we are the only ones who can defend ourselves. Our goals are simple and humane: by defending common human values, to create conditions for the honest relations of all people regardless of nationality on an equal footing, to reveal the potential of everyone for the benefit of Estonia and the Soviet Union.

A number of documents were adopted at the rally. The meeting ended in the singing of the "Internationale."

Victory Day Observance in Estonia Deplored

90UN1836A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 10 May 90 p 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Tarakanov: "Against Common Sense"]

[Text] **Some political retouchers would like to smudge black ink all over Victory Day—the holiday that is sacred for all of the Soviet people. On the eve of this day the Tartu council of the Estonian Union of Workers asked the workers of the republic to come to work on 9 May and to give all the money they earn that day to Lithuania.**

"This appeal is nothing but blasphemy. It is hard to understand why they raised this problem in Tartu. Tartu was the site of a concentration camp during the Great Patriotic War where the Nazis and their helpers killed 12,000 people. Twenty thousand soldiers and officers of the Red Army died fighting for this city. There were Estonians among them also. As for collecting money to aid Lithuania, the workers could do it on any other free day. It is a political challenge to Moscow, another step toward the confrontation with the Russian-speaking part

of the population and with the Army. Are we going to turn so petty and primitive in Estonia that we will cancel this memorable holiday?"

These words were spoken by a deputy of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, Colonel of the Border Troops Ye. Kochegarov. He said this on 7 May at a session of the parliament, but it was decided not to consider his speech as a resolution of the session. As a result, many enterprises that are members of the Estonian Union of Workers were working on 9 May.

"The workers decided for themselves whether they wanted to work or not," said A. Rapp, chairman of the Estonian Republic Council of War and Labor Veterans. "We cannot denounce them for it. They showed their solidarity with the people of Lithuania. And that is understandable if we are fighting for our independence. The Union enterprises, where the majority of workers are Russian-speaking, were not open."

The preparations for the military parade did not go all that smoothly. Against the orders of the USSR minister of defense and against common sense, the Tallinn City Soviet did not give a permit to conduct it until the last minute. Even more than that: On that day, the day of the great celebration, the city soviet held its session.

This attitude toward a holiday full of special meaning for all of progressive mankind cannot be called just frivolous. Everything related to any moments of glory in our history is either defiled or suppressed in the republic. And then other events become exaggerated or given the desired political coloring.

They held a big celebration, for instance, to commemorate Yuryev [St. George's] Night—23 April 1343. Torches and candles were lit on the Toompea in Tallinn. Speeches were made by Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Ryuytel, the chairman of the government; E. Savisaar; and others. The main subject of the speeches was the same, and it was displayed most obviously in the words of Savisaar and of Estonian TV commentator R. Yaarlik.

"It is not enough for us to be free on a leash," Yaarlik said. "Even if the leash is made a little longer."

"Our only goal is our independence. There cannot be a free Estonia without a free Latvia and a free Lithuania. We can win only by being together. And we will win," agreed Savisaar.

The adoption of the law "On Estonian Symbols" by the Supreme Soviet of the republic gave a special touch to the celebration. As became known, late on 8 May the Supreme Soviet Presidium of what is now the Estonian Republic declined the protest announced by the "For Equal Rights" and "Communists' Faction" deputy groups. The groups spoke against the adoption of this standard law and the Presidium offered to let them start negotiations. There was no official word on the display of state flags on 9 May; however, many houses and offices were decorated with the usual red banners with the Baltic wave on them.

An attempt was made to spoil the celebration. On the night of 8 May somebody poured red paint over the monument to the soldiers—the liberators of Tallinn. Everything was cleaned up by morning and the veterans who gathered by the eternal flame were able to honor the memory of the fallen soldiers and put flowers at the foot of the monument.

A military parade took place in Freedom Square.

A gala concert was given for the victory soldiers in the Tallinn city concert hall.

New Latvian Central Committee Members Announced

90UN1578A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 10 Apr 90 pp 2, 3

["Members of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] Aboltin, E.E., secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Riga Gorkom [city party committee].

Alksins, V.I., serviceman.

Andrianov, V.V., party committee secretary at the Liyepaya "Lauma" Textile and Haberdashery Production Association.

Anton, Yu.G., party committee secretary at the Liyepaya General Construction Trust and first secretary of Liyepaya Gorkom.

Afendik, V.L. party committee secretary at the "Alfa" Production Association.

Baranov, V.P., grinder at the Riga industrial robot plant.

Bartashevich, A.A., chairman of the Rezeknenskiy Interfarm Construction Organization.

Belaychuk, A.K., chief of the Latvian Civil Aviation Administration.

Belukha, A.N., first secretary of Proletarskiy Raykom [rayon party committee], Riga City.

Berezutskiy, V.P., serviceman.

Beskrovnov, S.A., party committee secretary in the Daugavpils General Construction Trust.

Bitler, I.A., director of the Riga No. 7 secondary school.

Bolshakov, N.P., deputy director of the Riga freight car construction plant.

Brokan, V.Ya., chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII.

Buylov, N.M., deputy general director of the "Latrybprom" Production Association.

Buka, S.A., deputy chief of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Ministry of Public Education Main Administration for Higher Education.

Varvarenko, V.A., deputy chief of the Ventspils maritime trading port.

Varnas, V.P., first secretary of Balvskiy Raykom.

Vasilenok, A.Ye., editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA.

Vidavskiy, A.A., chairman of Daugavpils [Gorispolkom] [city executive committee].

Volobuyev, V.T., troop commander in the Red Banner Baltic Border District.

Gaponenko, V.K., chief of the Red Banner Baltic Border District.

Garayev, I.A., first secretary of Leninskiy Raykom.

Gorbunov, A.V., chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Grizhenkov, M.Ya., deputy director of the "Yelgavselmash" plant.

Gusev, N.I., chief of the Latvian Republic customs house.

Daukshis, S-V.B., Latvian SSR procurator.

Dzenish, A.A., director of the "Tsirma" sovkhoz [state farm] in Ludzenskiy Rayon.

Dzirlank, O.K., first deputy procurator in the Baltic Transport Procuracy.

Dimans, S.L., docent at the University of Latvia.

Dmitriyev, Yu.N., first secretary of Kraslavskiy Raykom.

Dombrovskaya, Ye.M., electrician at the "Rigas Tsementniyeks" State Production Cooperative.

Duda, Ya.B., Latvian SSR military commissar.

Yegorov, O.V., fitter at the "Stars" plant.

Yekhanson, E.V., chairman of the Latvian SSR Committee for State Security.

Zharkov, V.V., first secretary of Daugavpils Gorkom.

Zinchenko, O.V., member of the military council and chief of the political directorate in the Red Banner Baltic Military District.

Zotchik, Yu.Ye., chairman of the trade union committee at the Riga State Electrootechnical Association (VEF).

Ivanov, I.N., captain of the motor ship Sukhe-Bator of the Latvian Maritime Steamship Company.

Ivanov, V.Ya., party committee secretary at the Ventspils port plant.

Kazakov, O.A., longshoreman at the Riga maritime trade port.

Kalinina, L.M., teacher at the No. 5 secondary school imeni Z. Ozola, Riga City.

Kalnin, Ya.Ya., section chief at the "Rizhskiy Elektromashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association.

Karev, A.N., director of the Daugavpils transmission chain plant.

Kauls, A.E., chairman of the "Adazhi" agricultural firm.

Klautsen, A.P., first secretary of Riga Gorkom.

Kolosov, V.V., senior scientific associate at the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Physics.

Kondurov, V.S., manager of the USSR Ministry of Transport Construction "Mostostroy-5" Trust.

Kononov, A.V., party committee secretary at the Riga Scientific Research Institute of Radioisotope Instruments.

Krols, V.Ya., chairman of the Daugavpilsskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies Ispolkom [soviet executive committee].

Krukovskiy, E.I., general director of the "Tekhnopribor" Production Association.

Krumin, V.M., chairman of the republic council of war veterans and veterans of labor.

Krupko, A.S., executive director of the Leningradskiy Rayon Association of Industrial Enterprises, Riga City.

Krustinson, M.M., pensioner, member of the CPSU since 1912.

Kuzmin, F.M., commander of troops in the Red Banner Baltic Military District.

Kukel, P.K., general director of the "Yurmala" Production Association.

Lantsers, Ya.A., chairman of the "Latviyas Tseltniyeks" Association of Construction and Industrial Construction Materials.

Loskutov, G.N., chief of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee organizational party work and cadre work department.

Lyalin, Yu.A., first secretary of Leningradskiy Raykom.

Mantulnikov, O.N., chief of the organizational department and second secretary of Liyepaya Gorkom.

Marushchak, S.P., party committee secretary in the Riga section of the Baltic Railroad Line.

Matyushonok, G.F., secretary of Yelgava Gorkom.

Meystars, V.Ya., punch operator at the "Avtotransprotsess" Scientific Production Association experimental plant, Riga City.

Miller, V.O., director of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Law.

Misan, A.P., instructor in the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

Misurkin, O.G., first deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers.

Mogilin, A.V., party committee secretary at the State Electronics Factory Production Association imeni V.I. Lenin.

Moshenko, O.A., chief of the Baltic Railroad Line.

Nefedov, P.F., general director of the Riga "Latviya" Production Association.

Novikov, V.I., administration chief at the State Cooperative Enterprise "Yugla" paper and cardboard factory.

Ostrovska, I.K., lecturer in the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Panasenko, V.I., assistant rector of the Riga Institute of Civil Aviation Engineers.

Parfenov, N.I., lathe operator at the "Ellar" plant.

Potekhin, O.Ye., grinder at the Yekabpils branch of the Riga "Avtoelektropribor" plant.

Potreki, O.D., professor at the University of Latvia.

Prokofyev, I.K., first secretary of Oktyabrskiy Raykom.

Ratnikov, A.V., party committee secretary at "Rigapromstroy" and secretary of Kirovskiy Raykom.

Rogal, M.F., chief of the Riga Regional Power Station.

Romanov, P.I., first secretary of Preylskiy Raykom.

Rubiks, A.P., first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Ruben, Yu.Ya., consultant to the Latvian SSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] "Delta" Engineering Center.

Rudzitis, Yu.V., director of the Ministry of Health No. 2 Hospital.

Rymashevskiy, V.F., first deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers.

Safonov, A.V., design engineer in the "Kommutator" Production Association "Impuls" independent design bureau.

Sergeyeva, N.F., weaver at the Riga Cotton Production Association "Rigas Manufaktura".

Serdyukov, V.L., party committee secretary in the Riga Gorispolkom internal affairs administration.

Seleznev,A.P., serviceman.

Silin, A.A., chairman of the Latvian Republic Trade Union Council.

Stepanko, O.A., brigade leader at the "Khimvolokno" Production Association, Daugavpils City.

Stroganov, F.F., first secretary of Ludzenskiy Raykom.

Tarvid, A.M., chairman of the labor collective Council of Nationalities of the Rezeknenskiy milking equipment plant.

Terekhov, V.S., second secretary of Riga Gorkom.

Timchenko, V.P., member of the military council of the Baltic Military District.

Trubinysh, Ya.Ya., deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Committee for State Security.

Urbanovich, Ya.V., first secretary of the Latvian SSR Komsomol Central Committee.

Kheninsh, A.O., deputy editor of the newspaper TSINYA.

Khermanis, V.V., machine operator at the Gulbene marshalling depot.

Churakova, N.A., engineer-technologist at the "Radiotekhnika" Production Association, shop party organization secretary.

Shalina, A.S., party organization secretary at the "Latgiproprom" Design Institute.

Shkil, B.I., brigade leader at the Riga diesel plant.

Shteynberg, V.A., board chairman of the Latvian SSR "Znaniye" Society.

Shteybrik, B.Ya., Latvian SSR minister of internal affairs.

Shcherbakov, S.I., first secretary of Moskovskiy Raykom.

Eglit, E.P., party committee secretary in the Latvian Maritime Steamship Company.

Yandulin, V.I., second secretary of Rezeknenskiy Gorkom.

Latvian Party Congress Financial Report Viewed

90UN1580A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 2

[Unattributed report: "The 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress. The Accountability Report of the

Auditing Commission to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Congress. Presented by Chairman of the Auditing Commission A. Berg-Bergman"]

[Text] Comrade delegates, the political situation today demands from communists specific action to resolve the complexities that have been created and to work out their own platform. This should also include economic and financial matters of which little has been said up to now, and with little emotion. But it is common knowledge that in order for the party to exist its must have its own assets, and it must not only acquire them but also use them in a purposeful manner.

Something else is also common knowledge, namely that any party, like any other structure created on a voluntary basis, has its own institutions of control that are entrusted with carrying out specific functions.

During the accountability period these functions have been carried out by the Auditing Commission elected at the 24th Latvian Communist Party Congress.

What has it been doing? Primarily it has been monitoring use of the party budget and has conducted regular checks on the purposeful and economical use of party assets and promptness in reviewing statements, complaints, and proposals from citizens.

During the past four years income to the party budget has amounted to R96,552,000, which is R8,463,000 more than during the previous five-year accountability period. In 1989 members' dues made up 62.6 percent of all party receipts and not only covered all spending by the republic party organization but even exceeded this by R1.8 million.

Expenditures from the party budget over the past four years totaled 257,000 more than during the previous five years.

The checks carried out showed that the overwhelming majority of communists paid their members' dues promptly and in the amounts specified by the Rules.

Recently, however, the situation has sharply deteriorated. Whereas in previous years 200 to 500 communists used to make their payments late, last year the number rose to 8,720. Total dues owed have amounted to more than R85,000. It should also be noted that most of these communists have completely halted payment of their membership dues and have thus virtually divorced themselves from the party.

The requirements of the rules and the instructions stemming from them are being violated not only by communists but also by entire party organizations that have reached the arbitrary decision to pay lower membership dues and to retain half of the funds collected for their own use or not to transfer anything to the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee account.

The greatest violations of this kind have been permitted in Kuldigskiy, Talsinskiy, and Moskovskiy rayons in Riga city, at the "Latviya" Sewing Association, at eight primary party organizations in the Baltic Railroad Company, at the Iyetsavskiy secondary school in Bauskiy Rayon, in the No. 21 Highway Repair and Construction Administration, at the "Druva" kolkhoz [collective farm] in Saldusskiy Rayon, the "Draudziba" kolkhoz in Telgavskiy Rayon, and others.

During the accountability period individual communists have continued to pay amounts less than that laid down according to their income. The total underpayment over the four years has not decreased but rather increased by R8,000. As a result of a check conducted it was shown that another R67,900 should be paid to the party budget.

A significant proportion of communists, and also representatives of the public, are interested in the purposes for which membership dues are being used. I therefore draw the attention of delegates to the following figures. In 1986 members' dues made up 57.8 percent of income to the party budget, which was R268,000 more than all budget spending, but last year this is how these figures looked: 62.6 percent and R1,816,000. For your information, before 1978 the republic party organization used to receive a subsidy from the CPSU budget.

A total of 91 percent of members' dues was used by the republic party organization for its own needs.

During the past four years deductions from profit from the party publishing house amounted to R38.2 million, and this was all transferred to the CPSU Central Committee budget. Part of that sum was subsequently spent on the needs of the republic party organization and general party business, including implementation of the law on raising minimum pensions in 1989.

When it conducted its checks the auditing commission was satisfied that assets from the party budget were being used for the purposes intended, and in an economical manner: During the accountability period R3.1 million less than planned were spent.

But it would be improper not to mention also certain negative factors in party financial activity. For example, the Moskovskiy, Leningradskiy, Proletarskiy, Bauskiy, Liyepayskiy, Talsinskiy, and Yelgavskiy raykoms overspent their allocations on some items.

There is more. Considerable excesses of stocks of materials, spare parts, inventories of little value, and office supplies are being held at the warehouses of the publishing house and the Central Committee vehicle base.

Last year alone workers in the publishing house worked overtime totaling 15,379 hours. And one other fact: The publication of newspapers was not fully insured in terms of time schedules.

Comrade delegates, many important issues of party life will be resolved at this congress. The Auditing Commission asks that problems relating to membership dues be

included in them. During the precongress period the most diverse opinions were being expressed on the size of members' dues and items for their use. The one thing that they had in common was that members' dues should be reduced and that the sum retained by the primary party organizations for their own use should be increased.

At the same time attention should be paid to the fact that for various reasons the number of party members is declining and there will be considerably fewer opportunities for maintaining the party apparatus.

If we want to preserve the party structures while significantly reducing the size of membership dues and considerably increasing the proportion retained by the primary party organizations, we must think seriously about optimal proportions. It is our view that they could be defined thus: Reduce the maximum size of membership dues to two percent of wages and allow the primary party organizations to retain 30 percent of all sums collected as dues.

It is also necessary to take into account the fact that income to the party budget from the profits of the publishing house is also declining. We must therefore think about unconventional new ways to attract income.

What do we have in mind here? First of all, evidently, the leasing of buildings at the disposal of the party, various kinds of voluntary contributions, and income derived from the provision of services, for example, the vehicle base, the printing house, the computer center, and so forth.

It is also quite obvious that there is a need to transform the structure of the party organs, significantly reduce the staffs of party committees, and make more rational use of the premises that we have.

If the Riga Party City Committee is preserved, perhaps it will be more advisable to locate it in the Central Committee building. And, for example, the Oktyabrskiy Party Rayon Committee could be transferred to the premises of the Institute of Party History now under construction.

Let us think about whether we need the evening Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the permanent courses in their present forms. Annual operating costs are running at R770,000 but materials from checks show that their efficiency is very low. Difficulties are arising even in finding students. Attendance at lectures and seminars cannot withstand criticism, and student dropout is high. Only three to five students are attending the seminars in individual groups.

We are convinced that if the organizations that send them for training were to pay workers in party and soviet organs for improving their skills, and if in turn course graduates could hope for a pay raise, it would be quite another matter. It is obviously high time to introduce a principle of payment in this sphere.

The Auditing Commission expresses its conviction that, showing understanding for the role and place of finances in party life, the congress will determine an optimal procedure for the formation and use of the necessary monetary assets and will thus create normal conditions for the activity of the primary party organizations and their city, rayon, and republic structures.

Assets must not only be obtained but also strictly accounted for. Inasmuch as a considerable proportion of members' dues are left at the disposal of the primary party organizations, it is also necessary to think about new forms of control over their use so as to exclude even the slightest opportunity for abuse. The more so since such cases have been recorded in previous years in Ludzenskiy, Limbazhskiy, and Valmiyerskiy rayons.

Perestroyka attitudes in society and the growing political activeness in it are being reflected in the letters from citizens being received at the party Central Committee and the editorial offices of the party newspapers. Accordingly, work with letters and complaints occupies a significant place in them.

Over the past years the Central Committee has received 28,921 letters and received 7,393 visitors. Naturally, today the content of the letters and statements has changed.

The political events taking place in the republic have shifted into a secondary place the problems of the cities and rayons. This can be seen in the fact that last year 50 percent less statements relating to the provision of housing, municipal services, improving the operation of the municipal economy, settling labor disputes, and wages were received. At the same time there was a significant increase in the number of letters pertaining to urgent issues in sociopolitical life.

The authors of the letters are referring to the most important problems in the organization of party activity, internal party democracy, and the role of communists, and they are offering concrete proposals. Much attention is being paid to interethnic relations and the complex periods in the history of Latvia.

It should be noted that some of the proposals have already been implemented and resolutions on them have been adopted by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

A total of 69 statements and complaints were not dealt with in the time periods laid down. Most of them were connected with the Central Committee Ideological Department and the Organizational Party Work and Cadre Work Department.

The number of letters, proposals, and pieces published in the press has grown significantly in connection with the debate going on in the party. The CPSU Central Committee statement "On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic" evoked particular activeness on the part of the public. The party Central Committee received 1,009 letters in which people spoke out against the assessments made in

the statement. Many of them were signed by hundreds and thousands of people. A total of 76 letters supporting the statement were received.

In conclusion let me note that the Auditing Commission has been providing methodological assistance for the city and rayon auditing commissions.

It goes without saying that there have also been shortcomings in the work of the Auditing Commission. Not all of its members have been participating actively in the work of the commission. A whole range of questions pertaining to internal party life has not been analyzed in sufficient depth and there has been formalism in the assessment of them.

Comrade delegates, as it relinquishes its powers the Latvian Communist Party Auditing Commission offers it sincere good wishes that the congress delegates will reach the kind of decisions that will be in line with the aspirations of communists and all people of good will in the republic.

The Auditing Commission hopes that, while frankly expressing their opinions, delegates will at the same time have a tolerant attitude toward the opinions of others and will with a proper sense of responsibility decide the further fate of our party.

Thank you for your attention.

Sobolev Delivers Speech at Latvian Party Congress

90UN1580B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 10 Apr p 2

[ELTA report: "Report of the Credentials Commission for the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress Presented by V. Sobolev, chairman of the Commission and second secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] Esteemed congress delegates, the Credentials Commission here presents to you its report on the results of the examination of the documents of those communists empowered as delegates elected to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, and also certain figures characterizing their makeup. One striking feature of the present election of delegates is the broad democratic nature seen in the will of communists.

A total of 799 delegates have been elected to the Latvian Communist Party Congress, of whom 692, or 86.6 percent, have been elected to a congress for the first time.

All rayon and city party organizations in the republic are represented at the congress. A total of 478 delegates, or 60 percent, were elected at meetings or conferences in the primary party organizations.

Some 47 workers in industry, construction, transport, communications, and the services sphere have been elected.

Some 78 people, or 9.8 percent of the total, work in agriculture, and of them 19 are rank-and-file workers.

A total of 203 delegates are leaders in enterprises, organizations, and establishments, and in kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Some 174 delegates, or 21.8 percent of the total, work in the sphere of science, culture, public health, and education.

Delegates included 75 servicemen. They were elected to the congress from military units and formations deployed on republic territory. Some 21 of the communists present here in the hall today defended the freedom and independence of our motherland on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War.

A total of 127 women (15.9 percent of the total) have been elected as congress delegates.

Some 40.9 percent of congress delegates are Latvians, 42.8 percent are Russians, 6.15 percent Ukrainians, 5.5 percent Belorussians, 1.6 percent are Poles, 0.88 are Lithuanians, and 0.88 percent Jews. In all representatives of 12 nationalities have been elected.

The largest proportion of delegates (40.7 percent) are in the age group of 40 to 50. Six delegates younger than 30 have been elected, and 22.6 percent of delegates are in the age group 30 to 40. Some 61 delegates are older than 60.

In terms of party seniority, delegates are characterized as follows:

—96 delegates (12.05 percent) have party seniority of less than 10 years;
—310 delegates (38.9 percent) have party seniority of 10 to 20 years;
—286 delegates (35.8 percent) have party seniority of 20 to 30 years;
—78 delegates (9.8 percent) have party seniority of 30 to 40 years;
—19 delegates (2.4 percent) have party seniority of 40 to 50 years;
—4 delegates have party seniority of more than 50 years.

These are Comrades Aleksey Ivanovich Drobyazko, member of the CPSU since 1927; Eduard Zamelevich Feldman, member of the CPSU since 1929; and Grigoriy Pavlovich Popazov and Vladimir Aleksanrovich Churkin, both members of the CPSU since 1939.

Some 81.6 percent of delegates have a higher education, and they include seven professors, nine doctors of sciences, and 46 candidates of sciences. Some 37.3 percent of delegates have a political education.

The delegates include 17 USSR people's deputies and 34 Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic people's deputies.

A total of 195 delegates lead basic party cells—party groups and shop and primary party organizations.

Many delegates are actively involved in work in the various public movements and organizations in the republic. Some 10.6 percent of delegates are members of the Latvian People's Front. The delegates include 18 members of the Agricultural Union, 18 members of Interfront, and two members of the Komsomol.

These, then, are the basic figures characterizing the makeup of delegates to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, enabling the Credentials Commission to conclude that the congress will have major opportunities to reach important decisions.

After analyzing the documents submitted by the primary, rayon, and city party organizations, the commission has established that there have been a number of violations in the election of delegates. Protests, letters, and statements from communists have also been reviewed by the Credentials Commission.

Giving due consideration to the fact that the Kirovskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] failed to do adequate organizational work with respect to the election of delegates to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, the Credentials Commission voted by an absolute majority to recognize the credentials of congress delegates Comrades A.Ye. Vasilenko, V.S. Timoshenko, L.Ya. Misulovin, and O.D. Potreka, who were elected at a conference of supporters of CPSU unity, and it rejected the draft submitted by Kirovskiy Raykom.

The commission agreed with the protest from a number of party bureau secretaries in the creative organizations with respect to the fact that the Oktyabrskiy Raykom did not recognize the results of the election of Comrade L. Pasternak-Freyman as a delegate to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress by a branch meeting of communists in the creative organizations and has granted her full powers as a delegate.

After studying the documents, the Credentials Commission finds no basis for satisfying the protest made by some delegates from Liyepaya City. It is unable to recognize the credentials of Comrades L.N. Trushkina, A.M. Klyava, B.Ya. Bakhmetenko, and A.K. Kronberg, who were elected additionally (in addition to the number of delegates set as the standard for representation).

Less than 50 percent of registered communists attended some of the branch meetings in the Kirovskiy and Ludzenskiy party organizations. However, giving due consideration to the opinion of the minority and the fact that comrades have come to the congress and are taking part in its work, the Credentials Commission is submitting a proposal that Comrade K.P. Ilin, elected from the Kirovskiy Rayon party organization, and Comrades G.V. Matelenko, Yu.P. Keysh, and A.P. Melnis, elected from the Ludzinskiy Rayon party organization, be recognized as congress delegates with the right to speak, but with no vote.

The Credentials Commission proposes that the documents of authority of all other congress delegates be recognized as valid and that they be exchanged for their credentials.

Political Outlook for Latvia Examined

90UN1744B Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by TRUD correspondent G. Lapinya: "Latvia: A Dialogue Is Necessary"]

[Text] It was not necessary to be a prominent political figure to foresee the possible consequences of the closing of such a large-circulation and popular publication as the evening newspaper RIGAS BALSS, for which people stood in long lines at newsstands. Published in the Latvian and Russian languages, the "nightly" held its place firmly in the life of Riga residents as a timely source of information which made space available in its columns to all political parties and organizations. Nevertheless, on the eve of the 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party, seven members of the bureau of the Riga gorkom [city party committee] voted to close the newspaper, in this way punishing the editorial collective for "disobedience." So, the bureau achieved the only result to be expected: Thousands of readers felt that they were being punished unfairly. I was in the office of the deputy editor of the newspaper, Olga Starovoytova, only a half hour, and I already had a splitting headache from the incessant telephone calls. The readers expressed solidarity with the editorial staff, and they offered assistance. A special plenum of the board of the Union of Journalists of the republic was called, employees of the Press Club established a united council of editorial and typographical work collectives , and they proclaimed unanimous readiness to strike in the event of disciplinary sanctions with respect to the administration of publishing houses by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee....

A week and a half was spent on settling sensational passions. The "nightly" is published once again, the gorkom is organizing the publication of its own newspaper, and the reader is free to choose. But did this conflict and display of methods of force add to the prestige of the Communist Party?

One can only be astounded at the nonprofessionalism of some of our current politicians. "He who is not with us is against us"—this is the absolutely inconsistent meaning that is being introduced into the sense of the word "consolidation," which is so popular today: not unity for the benefit of achieving a common goal, but a subordination of the views of those who think differently. Such an approach to the resolution of differences that arise between "factions" of the Latvian Communist Party unfortunately also had an effect on the results of the recently held 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress. In the opinion of many communists, the drafts of the basic documents that were presented by the Central Committee could become the basis for a dialogue of all

intraparty trends. But they did not, and, as a result, two communist parties of Latvia entered the political arena: One on the platform of the CPSU (USSR People's Deputy A. Rubiks, the former mayor of Riga, became its first secretary), and the other, independent, conducted its constituent congress a week later (I. Kezbers, a former secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and also a USSR people's deputy, was elected chairman).

Both parties have to admit that the split occurred not only over ideological differences but also over social (the "independents" are supported by a majority of rural communists and the intelligentsia) and national symptoms. This means that neither one has particularly bright prospects for the future at present.

In addition, a recreated Christian Party has just announced itself, and the social democrats have initiated activity (incidentally, they also did not avoid a split in their own ranks), as did many other social organizations. I think that a suggestion that each resident of the republic must become a member of some party would be naive. Even with all the unprecedented politicization of society, very, very many people prefer to remain without a party, expressing their attitude on one or another sociopolitical course by means of voting in elections. And the elections of the republic's people's deputies showed that the problem does not lie in the numerical composition of the party.

About 200,000 residents of Latvia will still decide the fate of 17 seats in repeat elections on 29 April, but the correlation of forces in the new parliament is already being drawn clearly. A clear majority is for the adherents of the People's Front, and this, undoubtedly, will determine the strategy of the new Supreme Soviet. The Latvian People's Front parliamentary faction is already developing a draft declaration of independence, regulations, an agenda for the first session to be held on 3 May, and actual draft laws, including on citizenship.

The victory of the Latvian People's Front in the elections, given the heterogeneous demographic situation of the republic, also denotes support by a certain part of the Russian-speaking population. Nevertheless, it is clear that decisions concerning radical changes in the future development of Latvia will be perceived ambiguously. There will also be opposition in parliament—leaders of Interfront and ardent adherents of a single CPSU platform were also elected deputies, and they also represent the interests of a certain part of the population. The recently held constituent congress of the association of deputy groups "Soyuz," which adopted its own statute and platform, believes that it is premature to raise the question of the secession of Latvia from the USSR structure.

Whether one likes it or not, that is the reality that will have to be dealt with in elaborating the tactics of the Supreme Soviet. And if the errors of incapable politicians, who undermine the authority of their own party, are only an internal party matter in the final analysis, then parliament simply has no right to permit itself such a luxury. In view of the extremely contradictory views of the deputy factions, the initial phase of the work of parliament could be entirely unproductive, the more so since a conclusive majority of the parliamentarians do not have the experience of political and state activity.

Of course, anyone can try, but in the existing situation it is extremely necessary to have a reliable leader, a professional politician, who is capable of leading parliament through impending storms—the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Anatoliy Gorbunov, current chairman of the Supreme Soviet, has a high popularity rating. He attracted sympathy with his tact, equanimity, and ability to find variants of compromises in the most difficult situations which, for the extreme left and the extreme right, unfortunately is not acceptable. Incidentally, for this same reason Yanis Vagris, now former first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, was criticized on their part, and even at the 25th Congress the activity of the Central Committee which they managed was held to be unsatisfactory. But the voice of the people should be listened to: The editorial office receives letters with words of gratitude to Ya. Vargis, because of whom, the people believe, the republic has been able up until now to avoid an excessively sharp confrontation of opposing political forces.

That part of society is expressing support for Gorbunov which, assessing his previous activity, sees in him a guarantee that parliament will adopt comprehensive, well thought-out decisions. The non-Latvian part of the population, even the part that perceives the idea of the state independence of Latvia with understanding, especially needs such guarantees. The situation is being agitated by rumors and actions of citizens' committees that are preparing for the conduct of their own congress and are demanding recognition of the right to republic citizenship only for those born in Latvia before 1940. In this situation, these questions are natural: "Will the Russian language be taught in the schools of an independent republic?"; "Will it be possible to subscribe to newspapers and journals of the USSR?"; "Will I be able to travel to see relatives living in Russia?" And most likely these are not the only questions that are disturbing people. It is good when answers are received to direct questions: There is nothing worse than conjectures and fantasies.

Well, yes, Latvia does not have to stand on the threshold a long time, and a policy of independence no longer raises any doubts. About 8,000 participants in the all-Latvian meeting of people's deputies at all levels on 21 April voted for an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic, calling on it to do everything possible for a renewal of Latvian statehood through democratic, nonviolent methods. But what path will the republic take? Will this be a repetition of the Lithuanian version? Or a Latvian version? The former Supreme Soviet also established a commission for the development of measures for

the establishment of the economic and political independence of Latvia. The first negotiations have been held with the president of the USSR. As was noted in the report by its participants—I. Bisher, USSR people's deputy and deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities; A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet; V. Bresis, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic; and D. Ivans, Latvian People's Front chairman—neither party refuses further dialogue. Undoubtedly, this is the only promising method of untying tight knots.

Latvians Report on Meeting With Gorbachev

90UN1793A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 20 Apr 90 p 3

["Informational report from the Lativan delegation in Moscow" by I. Bishers, V.-Ye. Bresis, A. Gorbunov, and D. Ivans; report on interview with A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, conducted by LETA special correspondent S. Prokoshenko, on 19 April in Moscow: "Anatoliy Gorbunov: We Were Offered Conditions"]

[Text] In connection with the 5 April 1990 decree of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium on the proposal to the USSR leadership that it discuss the question of the restoration of Latvia's state sovereignty, a Latvian delegation met in the Kremlin on Thursday, 19 April, with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. Presidential Council members N. Ryzhkov, A. Yakovlev, and G. Revenko took part in the discussion. The Latvian side was represented by I. Bishers, V.-Ye. Bresis, A. Gorbunov, and D. Ivans.

The USSR president was informed as to the firm position of the majority of the newly elected Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on the restoration of Latvia's state independence. The USSR president said he considered the meeting in the Kremlin symbolic. In his opinion, the mission of the meeting was to start negotiations between groups of experts on further relations between the USSR and Latvia.

I. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and G. Tarazevich, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, were empowered as leaders of the groups of experts of the USSR.

A discussion in principle on the possibilities of the further development of Latvian statehood then took place. Latvia's representatives defended the opinion of the majority of the people of Latvia on the need for the restoration of Latvia's state independence. An independent Latvia would be prepared to establish the closest relations with the USSR on an equal basis.

The USSR president declared that he saw two main paths of further building relations between the USSR and Latvia. If Latvia wishes to acquire independence outside of the USSR, it must comply precisely with USSR law on the procedure of the solution of questions of a union republic's secession from the USSR. In turn, if Latvia expressed its consent to remain within the USSR, the USSR leadership would agree to enter into negotiations on an appreciable expansion of Latvia's political and economic independence.

Replying to the objections of Latvia's representatives that the proposed solution would not be supported among the Latvian people, the USSR president allowed the following possibility: Latvia could accorded special status within the framework of the USSR permitting the organization of relations between the USSR and Latvia on the principles of confederative relations. In this context N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, expressed a readiness to tackle the question of the military service of young men of Latvia on republic territory.

In conclusion of the discussion both parties were of the unanimous opinion that the experts should discuss and devise possibilities of the realization of the two said versions of the further development of Latvian statehood, and the Latvian people would choose.

The USSR president warned that if the Latvian Supreme Soviet proclaimed the republic's independence by unilateral enactment, no negotiations would continue.

Anatoliy Gorbunov: We Were Offered Conditions

A meeting of a Latvian delegation with USSR President M. Gorbachev took place on 19 April. A special correspondent of LETA sought an interview with one of its participants, A. Gorbunov, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet.

[Prokoshenko] Who initiated this meeting?

[Gorbunov] Our side. As you know, a special commission of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium had drawn up measures pertaining to the republic's transition to economic and political independence. Taking the results of the debate as a basis, we defined five main issues which could serve as the subject of our dialogue with the USSR president. I sent Mikhail Sergeyevich a letter and, when in Moscow, obtained his consent to the meeting.

[Prokoshenko] Who took part?

[Gorbunov] On our side USSR People's Deputies I. Bisher, V. Bresis, A. Gorbunov, and D. Ivans. On the president's side M. Gorbachev himself, N. Ryzhkov, A. Yakovlev, and G. Revenko. They are all members of the Presidential Council.

[Prokoshenko] What questions were discussed in the course of the conversation?

[Gorbunov] There was essentially just one—ways of restoring Latvia's state sovereignty. In M. Gorbachev's opinion, there are two ways. The first is that the republic's statehood be restored outside of the USSR on the basis of the recently enacted law. The second is that

Latvia remain within the USSR, but, with the aid of dialogue, discussion, or negotiation, the republic is accorded special status. M. Gorbachev warned that all this is possible only if the Latvian Supreme Soviet does not adopt a unilateral enactment following the Lithuanian example. We, for our part, emphasized that both these ways, the second particularly, could be perceived in the republic merely at the level of promises.

Essentially only the center's proposals were examined; our proposals were not discussed. The president stressed that he did not wish to study specifics and that he was expressing merely the principles on which our negotiations could develop henceforward. We were offered conditions, in fact. M. Gorbachev said, what is more, that if the republic agreed to them, a special group of experts, which was prepared to embark the next day even on an examination of specific issues, would begin work immediately.

[Prokoshenko] Does our side have reason to be satisfied with the results of the meeting?

[Gorbunov] I can express only my personal opinion inasmuch as the document which we signed reflects the general concerted viewpoint. It was stated for the first time, perhaps, at such a high level that Latvia could have special status. From this viewpoint the meeting was a big step forward. It was hard to expect from it some specific accords and signed documents, the more so in that nothing had been agreed in advance. We obtained confirmation of the fact that the center had formulated a specific mechanism and way of progressing in mutual dialogue. The meeting cannot, therefore, be called fruitless and meaningless.

[Prokoshenko] Thank you.

29 April Latvian Election Winners Listed

90UN1886A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 1 May 90 p 4

[Article by Department of Soviet Construction and Trade Union Life: "Sixteen of Seventeen Vacant Seats Filled in Parliament of the Republic. According to Repeat Election Results of 29 April"]

[Text] Repeat elections for people's deputies of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] were held in the republic on Sunday 29 April. Approximately 190,000 voters in Riga, Daugavpils, Rezekne, Ekabpils, and Valkskiy and Yelgavskiy Rayons decided who will represent their interests in the parliament of the republic.

We will recall for the readers that 30 candidates contended for 17 deputy seats. It can be said now that 16 seats have actually been filled. The campaign was sharp and harsh, and in a number of districts the winner was determined by a margin of only dozens of votes.

So, here are those (according to preliminary data) who became people's deputies of the Latvian SSR:

I. Garayev—secretary of the Leninskiy Rayon Party Committee (Riga 9th Electoral District).

Ya. Dzintars—candidate of historical sciences (14th District).

A. Pershin—general director of production association "Darba spars" (17th District).

M. Berdikov—director of the Riga electromechanical plant of the production association "Radiotekhnika" (19th District).

V. Kostin—military commissar of Moskovskiy Rayon of the city of Riga (32d District).

S. Buka—deputy chief of the main administration of higher education of the Ministry of National Education of the republic (39th District).

A. Smolyuk—director of Riga secondary school No. 74 (60th District).

V. Zatulyviter—senior teacher of the Riga Higher Military Political School imeni Biryuzov (65th District).

A. Providenko—chief of the Daugavpils general building trust (73d Daugavpilskiy District).

S. Beskrovnov—secretary of the party committee of the general construction trust (75th Daugavpilsskiy District).

A. Reshetnikov—machinist instructor of the shop "Rezekne" of the locomotive depot "Daugavpils" (99th Rezeknenskiy District).

G. Radionov—general director of the production association "Dolomit" (127th Yekabpilsskiy District).

I. Kozakevich—translator for the production association "Daylrade" (129th Yekabpilsskiy District).

M. Vulfson—USSR people's deputy, senior teacher of the Academy of Art of the Latvian SSR (132d Elenskiy District).

A. Buls—deputy general director of "Latbiofarm" (171st Olaynskiy District).

D. Ivans—USSR people's deputy, chairman of the Duma of the Latvian People's Front (192d Smiltenskiy District).

Riga voters in the 44th District, apparently, will have to complete another entire election campaign: Neither of the two contenders garnered more than half of the votes. Repeat elections will be held here not later than two months from now. Once again candidates will have to be nominated, and once again preelection propaganda will be exercised.

Indeed, the voters will most likely greet this news without enthusiasm. But the law is the law and, undoubtedly, it has to be observed.

Now, as these lines are being written, a meeting is going on of the Central Electoral Commission of the Latvian SSR, which should finalize the results of the elections held on 29 April. Protests that came in from two electoral districts are also being examined. Perhaps there will be some changes. Therefore, the final distribution of forces in parliament will become clearer after several days.

Nevertheless the main result of these elections is apparent: Of the 16 new people's deputies, 12 stated clearly in their election programs that they do not visualize Latvia's destiny outside the USSR. And a majority of the 190,000 voters supported the aspiration that everyone together resolve the difficult tasks that confront the republic and the search for ways to achieve national conciliation and civic peace.

The only thing that is to be regretted: If only this kind of an understanding of the existing situation and this degree of responsibility had existed among the voters on 18 March!..

We thank all of those of our voters who heeded the recommendations of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA and who supported candidates who held democratic positions.
[signed]Department of Soviet Construction and Trade Union Life

Lenin Cited on 'Tolerance' for Lithuania

PM2704140790 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 26 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by Yevgeniy Blinov of Soviet NOVOSTI news agency: "The Soviet Union Brought Into Disrepute"]

[Text] The Lithuania problem has the attention not only of all the people in the Soviet Union but also of many others throughout the world. The republic has stated that its accession to the Soviet Union was invalid and has declared its independence. The popularly elected parliament has set in motion a return to capitalism. This situation is extremely unpleasant for us, because in my view it brings the Soviet Union into disrepute, creates a whole series of economic and interethnic problems, and makes worse the situation in the whole country which was bad enough as it was.

In this situation it is not easy for the Soviet Government to find a correct course of action. Such a course is difficult to find, but very necessary.

Above all we must try to understand the Lithuanian people and not try to fool ourselves that there is no unity there. The Lithuanian majority in the republic fully and firmly supports its parliament.

It is hardly productive to begin a discussion of whether the prewar agreements were valid or not. That is a formalistic approach. The crux of the matter is that the Lithuanian people feel wronged by the bureaucratic policies of the union state, are not satisfied with their economic position, and see no prospect of rapid change for the better within the framework of the Soviet Union.

In formal terms our policy is beyond reproach. We recognize Lithuania's right to leave, and we recognize every people's right to determine their own social system for themselves. But as international practice from the whole world shows, announcing a policy and implementing it are not always one and the same thing. There is also a disparity between our policy and the principles we have declared. We are actually increasing the pressure on this small people. We have brought a regiment of paratroops into Lithuania's capital "to protect certain objects and the rights of the Lithuanian population." We have replaced the republic's state prosecutor and begun drafting people for the Soviet Army, in the face of the measures adopted by the Lithuanian parliament. We have introduced economic sanctions and demanded that Lithuania's parliament suspend the laws it has passed—that is, we want public national humiliation. Why?

Well, simply because Lithuania is leaving the union in a way that does not square with a law that was adopted after [as published] the Lithuanian declaration of independence. In formal terms we are right. Lithuania is breaking the law. But in reality? Is this not one of the cases of which Lenin spoke: Correct in form, but a mockery in reality?

Our press—and this must be said in its praise—is trying to give the impression that it is providing objective coverage of events in Lithuania. But this is only the appearance. In reality it is slowly but surely setting public opinion against the Lithuanian people. This has already had some regrettable results. People began to tighten up deliveries to the republic and economic ties even before the official decision on this was made. The situation is being exacerbated by both sides. There can be no doubt that in this situation Lithuania feels itself to be an oppressed nation and views the government of the Soviet Union as the representative of the oppressors.

In the situation that has now arisen it may be very useful to recall what Lenin said in a similar situation. At the very end of 1922, when the Soviet Union was set up, he stressed that we must distinguish between the nationalism of a large nation and the nationalism of a small nation. "In the face of the latter type of nationalism we, who belong to a large nation, have almost always in historical practice been guilty of countless acts of violence, and are committing—without being aware of it ourselves—countless acts of violence and affronts... That is why internationalism on the part of an oppressor, or so-called large nation... not only consists in observing a formal equality between nations, but also in the oppressor—the large—nation's putting itself in an unequal position which compensates for the inequality which arises in real life. Anyone who has not understood this has not understood what a real proletarian attitude to the nationalities question is... What is important to the proletarian? For the proletarian it is not only important,

but even vitally necessary, to ensure that the non-Russian has maximum confidence in him in the proletarian class struggle.

"How can this be achieved? Here formal equality is not enough. Through his approach or his concessions to the non-Russian he must here make sure to overcome the distrust and the suspicion and the wrongs to which the non-Russian has been subjected in the past by the government of the 'great-power' nation...

"That is why in this case it is better to have too much obligingness and tolerance toward the national minorities than too little. In order to be really able to promote proletarian solidarity... we must therefore never adopt a formal attitude to the nationalities question, but pay attention the whole time to the fact that the proletarian in an oppressed (or small) nation will necessarily have a different relationship with the oppressor (or large) nation."

Much has changed since these lines were written. But the very core of Lenin's argument remains unchanged: It is impossible to defend internationalism or educate people into it through the exercise of power or pressure. The most important thing in relations between nations is trust. That is why consideration toward, understanding of, and concessions to the small nation on the part of the large nation can never do any harm. On the contrary, adopting a formal approach to the nationalities question is completely unacceptable. In the difficult times in which the Soviet Union finds itself it will be beneficial if we keep our political course in line with Lenin as often as possible.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Structure Established

90UN1646A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 7 Apr 90 p 1

["Resolution of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council on the Structure of Divisions Providing Support for the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council"]

[Text] The republic of Lithuania Supreme Council resolves:

1. To confirm the following structure of divisions providing support for the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council:

Secretariat of the Supreme Council Presidium;

advisers to permanent commissions of the Supreme Council and secretaries of Supreme Council deputies;

assistant-secretaries of Supreme Council deputies in the electoral districts;

department of information;
legal department;
administration of affairs;
department of protocol;
personnel department;
ublic reception room.

2. To charge the Supreme Council Presidium and its Budget Commission with drawing up a staff chart for these structural divisions.

3. To obligate the republic of Lithuania Council of Ministers to allocate and equip the necessary premises for the Supreme Council, its structural subdivisions, and the support staff, and provide office equipment for them.
[Signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council.
Vilnius, 5 April 1990

Lithuanian Party Leader Appeals For Unity

90UN1646C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 7 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by A. Meskauskas, member of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee: "To Unite for Noble Goals"]

[Text] In stable democratic societies in which a multiparty system, the competition of views, and parliamentary activities exist, all parties unite people bound together by a common goal. Party orientation is shown in practical pursuits, in the aspiration to organize the life of their native land in such a way that the party members choose. We came from a totalitarian society, we were (and deep down still remain) a state party; however, does this really make us criminals with blood on our hands for which we can be rebuked? Do we really have to be liquidated because of this?

There should not be any doubt in this matter because we stated our position and attitude toward the crimes and mistakes of the party at its 20th Congress and at the plenums. The second rebuke we hear is: You have lost the election so keep a low profile, lower than others. However, this is what I would say: We have to be active if, being quite active people, we want further movement and to accomplish something.

Let us look at our past, which oppresses not only us but all of Lithuania. Let us cast a glance at the remote history from which we came, and we will see the slogans put forth 200 years ago during the Great French Revolution—"Freedom, Equality, Fraternity" which the social democratic movement emerging later borrowed, somewhat modifying them—"Freedom, equality, solidarity!" In general, the communist party and the social democratic movements arose in the stream of the workers' movement, in the course of struggle for social justice. This is not a dogma, this is a fact.

The main objective of our political party is set forth in the program. It is a democratic society in which the main humanistic ideals of socialism should be translated into reality—individual freedom and social justice. We may only achieve this objective in an independent, democratic Lithuanian State; this is why the restoration of the

statehood of Lithuania is a priority task for the Communist Party of Lithuania as well. Rebukes that we are usurping someone else's ideas would be undeserved. Incidentally, this is also confirmed by the decisions of our congress.

Therefore, our goal is to become an innovative party, or a normal party in a regular democratic society, a democratic party understandable to all and expressing the aspirations of the working people. This phrase may be a bit overused, but it is so. We should altogether banish from our life authoritarian and centrist trends. The party should be open; its every word, action, and thought should be visible in our society. We may once again set forth the following main external aspects of our activities on this basis. First, we do not want to isolate ourselves and retire into our shell; for this reason a dialogue is necessary with the countries around us and their political forces in East and West Europe, where very profound changes are under way, especially in East Europe. Changes are under way in communist, workers', social democratic, and other forces of social progress, as well as in many umbrella forces of the Socialist International.

Second, our attitude toward the USSR. So, Article 6 of the Constitution is no more. However, the CPSU remains strong for now. Some actions of CPSU organizations, instigated or committed with regard to the Higher Party School, the House of Political Education, and the city committee of the party reflect the still existing dualism of sorts, or monopolism of sorts, in the Soviet leadership. Therefore the goal in this matter would be: an invitation to a dialogue, contacts with progressive forces in all republics.

This may be paradoxical, but at present the Communist Party of Lithuania is the most tolerant force. This is not a declaration but a fact, because working with the opposition in recent years has taught us this. We have understood that social progress can be ensured only by democratic, parliamentary methods. Therefore, we have certain structures, and we want to maintain them in order to fulfill our striving for democracy, pluralism, and social protection. If we seek this, and everyone understands what he wants, then we may say that we will become a guarantor of stability and democracy in Lithuania.

Keeping people in a state of continuous tension (which certain forces are building up) is dangerous from two points of view: It increases the danger of a social explosion and gives rise to indifference to politics. I would say that a return to what we have experienced is under way. Both of these dangers give the extremist forces a free hand. These forces are likewise dual: On the one hand, there is clear-cut anticommunism (this, however, does not affect us) and, on the other hand, the CPSU platform. So, there is a paradox: Supposedly without wanting to do this, these extremes unite and destabilize the situation, exacerbate tension, and play into the hands of the enemies of Lithuania. So once again people want progress, the fulfillment of their aspirations, and stability, and this is also becoming our task.

I may refer to elections in democratic Germany as an example. All predictions said that the Communist Party which used to be the ruling party will suffer an utter defeat in the elections, and they did not expect the Social-Democrats to do very well either. In Germany, the Communist Party got 16 percent of the vote on average, and the Social-Democrats 22 percent. Social protection was the main slogan of the latter. If we are going to adhere to this slogan—and there are things we can do—we may become a popular force and strive for pure and noble ideals. They believe that elections in Lithuania are our defeat. This is not a defeat of our ideas, this is the result of old totalitarian and Stalinist intolerance, suppressing the aspirations of the people, and many years of thoughtless activities.

Therefore, we recall yet again that democracy, the parliamentary option, tolerance, social protection and progress, and links with all progressive movements should become our goals, as well as propaganda in the good meaning of the word, certainly not the tired propaganda which we were used to for a long time.

Finally, the intraparty aspect. The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania, elections, instability in the country, and words hostile to us that are heard from all quarters have caused the ranks of the party to diminish. By now, 86,000 communists have made their self-determination. We do not know how many of them will actually become members of our party. There is nothing bad about the number of members of the party diminishing as long as fellow believers in an idea, enthusiasts remain. We will be able to seek what we desire. I repeat once again—loyalty to the ideals of social progress and the understanding that we are a party of Lithuania, serve the people of Lithuania, and strive for democracy, humanism and freedom sustain us, unite us, and prompt us to act.

Our activities are going to be quite effective if all of us—the Central Committee, its secretaries, and all rayon divisions—are going to work and will not hibernate and wait for instructions. First of all, members of the Central Committee commissions should begin to act more vigorously. Close contacts between Central Committee commissions and all rayon groups are necessary.

We know the dangers that may await us along this road: Old thinking and intolerance for the opinion of others. These are dangers of a general nature rather than our internal dangers. They are manifested in all distortions of the political life of Lithuania. Unfortunately, widely acclaimed pluralism has not become a comprehensive directive. We also see this in contemporary life.

I would call on all people to unite in order to implement our ideas. Let us not be afraid of difficulties. We will achieve these goals if we see clearly that we want to and can be the party that serves the people of Lithuania and translates into reality the ideals set forth in our program.

Supreme Council Issues Appeal to Youth on Draft

90UN1567B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1

[Appeal of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council: "To the Youth of Lithuania"]

[Text] As we see, Moscow, which for several decades has proclaimed the right of nations to self-determination, does not wish to allow Lithuania to live freely and independently. However, on our side we have the truth, which is recognized all over the world, our love for the homeland, tenacity, and unarmed, although united, opposition.

The Government of the USSR has announced the spring draft of young men into its Army. "What should I do?"—This is the question agitating the troubled boys of Lithuania, their mothers, and all of Lithuania. The democratic parliament of Lithuania, which you elected for the first time in 50 years and which restored the honor and dignity of its homeland on 11 March 1990, believes that by refusing to serve in the Army of a foreign state you will strengthen Lithuanian independence. A universal refusal to serve would be one more step to the benefit of Lithuania independence.

Although the authorities of Lithuania are powerless to defend the young men from forced recruitment, they nonetheless take upon themselves the legal and moral responsibility for the refusal of the citizens of their state to serve foreigners. The authorities will make every possible effort to defend you, sons of Lithuania. The Supreme Council has taken legislative measures to annul your obligation to serve in the USSR Army and to halt the activities of the military commissariats. The courts of Lithuania will not judge those who have refused to serve in a foreign army. Our government is investigating opportunities to replace military service with other duties for our country.

The leadership of the Lithuanian republic is making attempts to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union and obtain a final answer for this exceptionally important and troublesome issue. It has already appealed to the International Red Cross and to all organizations concerned with the defense of human rights for assistance in the event that disputes arise.

The Lithuania Supreme Council proposes that all youths of draft age register at self-administration points [punkty pri samoupravleniyakh] in order to make known their decision and their readiness for unarmed resistance. Each of you that is taken by force into the USSR Armed Forces will become a grievance and a concern not only for your family and friends but for all of us.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council

Vilnius, 4 Apr 1990.

Landsbergis Cited on Possible Military Coup

90UN1567C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1

[Declaration of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council]

[Text] On 11 March 1990 the democratically elected Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council reestablished an independent Lithuanian state and the government of the Republic of Lithuania and the other state institutes, which are carrying out their functions with the support and approval of the public.

However the USSR, using its Armed Forces and other means, is trying to increase tension in Lithuania and disrupt the normal workings of the state organs of Lithuania. With the goal of concealing the aforementioned actions from the world public and suppressing sources of information, the Soviet Union is blocking international communications and prohibiting the activities in Lithuania of diplomats and journalists of other countries.

These and other aggressive actions of the USSR crudely violate the universally acknowledged principles of international law and create a real threat to the Republic of Lithuania's state sovereignty and the lives and health of its people.

With the help of its army the USSR supports a small group of political adherents who are pursuing the goal of restoring the old structures of USSR administrative control in the Republic of Lithuania. In this fashion there arises the danger of an overthrow of the legally elected authority and the government which has been formed in Lithuania.

In the face of a real threat to the independence of Lithuania, the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council declares:

All responsibility for the people's misfortune and for the political consequences of a military coup rests on the highest leadership of the USSR.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council.
[Dated]Vilnius, 4 April 1990.

Landsbergis Writes Gorbachev on Draft

90UN1802C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 24 Apr 90 p 1

[V. Landsbergis letter to USSR President M. Gorbachev]

[Text] The Kremlin, Moscow, USSR

Having by the will of the people restored the statehood of Lithuania, cultivated and defended for centuries, the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council is well aware of the problematical nature of the new situation for the

USSR. The deputies are firmly convinced that the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state based on the nonrecognition in the USSR and throughout the world of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its consequences cannot be detrimental to the perestroyka you are pursuing in the Soviet Union, the process of the extension of democracy, and the efforts to create a state based on the rule of law and also the concept of new political thinking.

The Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council is not ignoring the legitimate interests of the USSR in the Republic of Lithuania. It has for this reason emphasized repeatedly a willingness for consultations, dialogue, and the establishment of other contacts which would make it possible to avoid confrontation and permit the concordance of the two parties' vitally important interests by way of constructive negotiations.

Not denying the historical memory of the Lithuanian people, not violating the fundamental principles of Lithuanian statehood, and not encroaching upon the feeling of national dignity, the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council displays an adherence to such flexible and mutually acceptable a spirit of negotiations as is alone possible under present conditions and which could create practicable prerequisites for a rapprochement of the parties' positions, affirming primarily the affinity of basic interests.

The Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council Presidium also understands the USSR leadership's concern at the reluctance of young men of Lithuania to serve in the USSR Armed Forces. The Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council has already expressed its attitude toward this problem and has assumed the moral responsibility for the possible consequences in connection with a refusal to serve. However, this problem does not only concern the spring draft into the army of young men from Lithuania, as indicated in your telegram. This problem is far broader, and it is this, in our opinion, that will be a most important subject of future consultations and negotiations. No obstacles will be put in the way of the young men who express a desire to serve in the army of the USSR.

We would like our decisions concerning identification of the citizen of the Republic of Lithuania to be correctly understood also. You are aware of the Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Lithuania enacted on 3 November 1989, in accordance with which all permanent residents of the republic, regardless of nationality, may without any limitations become citizens of Lithuania. A citizen's ID, which may be obtained by all citizens of Lithuania without exception, does not infringe anyone's rights and liberties and endows no one with additional privileges. Our laws clearly enshrine the provision that all citizens of Lithuania enjoy and will in the future continue to enjoy equal socioeconomic rights and liberties. Such guarantees will be provided by the Law on the Status of the Citizen of the USSR in the Republic of Lithuania, which is being drawn up.

Both big and small, powerfully armed and unarmed countries, if they are guided by the principles of humanism, can and should find a way out of all complications acceptable to civilized societies, and find the wisest solutions by the sole path of political dialogue. This applies all the more to the property disputes between social and political organizations. The brutal beatings of civilians perpetrated today in the city of Vilnius by detachments of the USSR Armed Forces undoubtedly merits your condemnation, and the culprits should deservedly be punished.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis
on behalf of Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council Presidium
20 April 1990, Vilnius.

Prunskiene Addresses Council on Government Plans

90UN1696A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 13 Apr 90 pp 1, 3

[Report by Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania, to the Supreme Council: "Directions of Government Activity"]

[Text] I may today speak about the directions of the government's activity and the immediate tasks or problems which need to be tackled, but not about a program. This is why. The last minister was appointed exactly one week ago. It is understandable, therefore, that the government, not having formed its structure, could not have prepared an expanded program. So, formation of the government is, it may be said, complete. One deputy prime minister has yet to be appointed, but this is not preventing us working to effect. Seventeen ministers have been appointed. Five of them were members of the previous government, but two of them, only for a few months. The youngest minister, Daryus Kuolis, is only 28, the oldest, 65. The average age is 49. Members of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party constitute less than half of the government, and the activity of two of them as party members has been suspended. We have one member of the Social Democratic Party and one representative of the Christian Democratic Party. Nonparty persons constitute half the government.

The government is forming its own structures and determining the functions of both the machinery of the Council of Ministers and the ministries and also their distribution between the chairman and the vice chairmen. Compared with the former machinery, that of the Council of Ministers is smaller by approximately one-third. The institution of departments as structural subdivisions is being eliminated, and a body of advisers and their experts is being formed. While the structures are taking shape and while some ministries have done only half of this work, we may realistically speak only about a period of determination of the list of problems. And only after this about the methods and specific measures for solving these problems.

As far as the direction of the government's activity is concerned, we could distinguish two major groups of problems: establishment of independence and the reforming of Lithuania's social and economic system. In other words, what kind of Lithuania should we have and how to achieve this?

The documents adopted on 11 March formed the legal foundations of the revival of statehood. However, in order to firmly establish them it is necessary to solve a multitude of problems. It is clear that major politicians of the big Western states are about to and may leave us to the discretion of the Soviet Union, if these states' public opinion agrees with this, of course.

A certain diplomatic blockade is being implemented. Foreigners are being denied permission to come to Lithuania. For this reason actions pertaining to the establishment of independence should be differentiated and exercised in both an eastern and western direction. Of course, there would be no obstacles to our recognition in the West were this not opposed by the Soviet Union. There are as yet, however, no visible signs of good will on the part of the Soviet Union in agreeing to negotiate with us outside the framework of the USSR Constitution. The government will have to operate by specifying the content of this dialogue with Moscow and orienting it toward negotiations.

Judging by recent correspondence with the USSR Government, hints at a mutual interest in the start of negotiations can already be seen, although once again within the framework of the USSR Constitution. Yesterday we were very specific in wording an appeal to the Government of the Soviet Union on the start of negotiations and consultations on these negotiations, noting that a Lithuanian Government delegation should be received in Moscow. We have not yet received a reply.

We are preparing for negotiations. In order to neutralize the tension in certain spheres of relations, in the economy particularly, we are attempting to harmonize with Moscow leaders at the appropriate level specific problems in the supply sphere and the activity of individual enterprises. Our ministers, ministry staff, and representatives of enterprises are dealing with this. Lithuania's industry and specific enterprises are successfully fulfilling their commitments to the Union, and this is very important at this time.

Preparation of a draft treaty is being completed, although we are, it is true, constantly making amendments to it in respect of methodological completeness in order, if necessary, that it might be possible to promptly present it to the Supreme Council.

We have difficulties too. It will be particularly difficult taking over the transport sectors, regulating the borders and coordinating the activity of the customs services and foreign affairs.

The main thing which we need to avoid is the imposition of presidential rule. We must not allow reactionary forces to provoke processes, even those which would be pseudo-arguments.

Relations with other states, except for diplomatic issues, which, as you know, concern the position of the Soviet Union, are being resolved more easily and productively.

This month even we have been invited and will go to Canada, the United States, and Norway and, most likely, Denmark also. And we will receive certain delegations of quite a high level. Cooperation between Lithuania and these states will be discussed.

The second list of problems amounts to the preparation and implementation of a program of reforming the social and economic system for the purpose of protecting Lithuania against deformations and the consequences of the Soviet system. The "Sajudis" program, certain documents of the former Supreme Soviet, the activity of the Economic Reform Commission, and this commission's process stock will enable us to create and enact new laws relatively quickly. I believe that in the future the executive authority will have to display law- making initiative more actively, as is customary in civilized states. Laws should reach the finish line following discussion by the parliamentary and executive authorities, given normal balance. But when the Law on Government was enacted, there was no such balance, unfortunately. This could happen with other laws which are being discussed currently also. The laws must really be implemented. The solution of a problem does not end with the enactment of a law, it only begins. In this sense it is exceptionally important to successfully resolve questions of the delimitation of power; that is, of the jurisdiction of the parliament and the government. The strength of Lithuania and its good name in the world will depend on this.

Accents of humanism and culture, regardless of the sphere which this concerns—spiritual, economic, or specific industrial- engineering—should be predominant both in the laws themselves and in the mechanism of their implementation.

The general outlines of the socioeconomic reform are essentially clear and have been debated repeatedly. However, their specification will require intensive work both in parliament and in the government and its commissions. The transition from a command to a moderately state-controlled, socially oriented market economy means primarily the creation of a diversity of forms of ownership. And this should be served by a program of privatization, the formation of conditions of a market and competition and also the implementation of these measures, and the creation of a hard currency. I would like to emphasize that approximate designs have been selected, processing solutions agreed and methods of production in various states examined; in a word, we have approached the specific subjects with which this will be effected. However, once again political obstacles

arise. The Government of the Soviet Union is pressuring other states to ensure that they not print money for Lithuania. We hope to overcome this obstacle.

It is important to create adequate state institutions and structures of all levels; in other words, to rationally form a government machinery and the structures and functions of the ministries. It is essential to delegate as much actual jurisdiction as possible to the self-managing entities and independent economic subjects and, of course, to optimize the interaction of all these structural components and all subjects—the government and the self-managing entities, the self-managing entities and the enterprises, the enterprises among themselves, ministries and enterprises of the Republic of Lithuania, and so forth.

The reforming of education, science, and health care, the creation of information and statistical systems and many other problems await conceptual solution. However, there should inevitably be at the focus of attention the most serious of them all—social security, minimum wage guarantees, regulation of employment, and provision of the Lithuanian population with apartments. It will be necessary in this sphere to combine the gradually introduced market and social guarantees for groups of low-income people. Official policy must combine humanism and strictness and the social orientation of the implemented measures and strict regulation of finances and the economy. I would like specifically to mention the State Tax Inspectorate, which was established a few days ago and which will be assigned a very important role. I see a connection between the activity of the financial inspectorate and the possibilities of the creation of sources of money for the implementation of social security measures. We have begun to eliminate privileges, from ourselves primarily, canceling certain benefits.

I believe that the government is duty bound to attend to the solution of national problems, although it is desirable that these processes occur naturally and fittingly. I would recall that the Independence Fund has been established and the appropriate account created by decision of the Supreme Council.

I would like to say in conclusion that the members of the government have settled down to work very actively and understand what an important, crucial, and difficult mission has fallen to them. Looking into all problems and seeking methods of their solution, we will prepare an expanded program of government activity in each field.

Independent Lithuanian Party Declaration

90UN1862A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 28 Apr 90 p 1

[Declaration by the Central Committee Bureau of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania: "Workers of the Republic of Lithuania!"]

[Text] The First of May is approaching—the day of international solidarity of workers. Unfortunately, the economic blockade imposed by the USSR has darkened the holiday mood of the residents of Lithuania. The blockade is directed against all the inhabitants of the republic without exception. Whether they wish it or not, such actions open the way to confusion, and attempts are being made to provoke international and social conflicts and, in this fashion, to halt the restoration of our independent state.

Let us be alert and not yield before these intentions. The fate of Lithuania is in our hands. History proves that freedom does not come by itself—one must fight for it. And right now we all understand this: The workers of Lithuania of all nationalities are not yielding to difficulties and are showing determination, patience, restraint, and a desire for civil unity.

For us today, international solidarity of the workers is not just a holiday slogan. We really have felt the help of the USSR's democratic forces and the solidarity of the people of good will of the whole world. We will not let them down, and we will be worthy of the delegates we elected.

The independent Lithuanian Communist Party, sharing difficulties with all the residents of Lithuania on the road to independence, joins them and the democratic political forces of Lithuania for realistic steps in defense and consolidation of the 11 March act. It always has and always will support the majority of Lithuania's workers, and consequently it will represent and defend in the republic's parliament and in all its political activities the social and national rights of workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia and the principles of democracy, humanism, and genuine internationalism.

Greeting the workers of the Republic of Lithuania on May Day in this hour of difficult trials, we urge that this spring holiday be turned into a demonstration of solidarity, civil unity, and the determination of the inhabitants of Lithuania of all nationalities to defend independence.

RSFSR

Kuleshov Elected Head of Altay Kraykom

PM1904100390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Kraykom Plenum Held"]

[Text] Barnaul, 13 Apr—An Altay CPSU Kraykom [Kray Committee] plenum has been held to examine an organizational matter. Following a preliminary discussion of candidates in the kray's party organizations the plenum elected A.A. Kuleshov, who had worked as chairman of the kray soviet, as first secretary of Altay CPSU Kraykom.

RSFSR Trade Union Federation Plenum Held

904F0144A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Apr 90 p 1

[A. Kozlov, V. Pisarchik report: "First Steps"]

[Text] Moscow—A plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Independent Trade Unions Federation Council was held yesterday. As I.Ye. Klochkov, chairman of the federation, emphasized, the plenum was mainly of an organizational nature.

Specifically, there was discussion of the procedure of organizations' entry into the FNPR [Independent Trade Unions Federation], in accordance with which unions of the RSFSR, republic organizations of sectoral unions of the USSR, regional interunion trade union organizations representing the interests of trade union organizations of the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts and other professional formations of working people created in the Russian Federation may be members of the federation. A primary trade union organization may be a member of the federation only if the trade union and the regional interunion trade unions organization of which this organization is a member are not members of the federation.

Seven standing commissions were formed from members of the Federation Council: for economic reform and social safeguards; protection of labor and the environment; legislative initiative and remedial work; recovery of the countryside; humanitarian problems and youth issues; trade union building; financial work and state social insurance.

The entire work of the Russian trade union center will be organized through the activity of the commissions. This structure is designed to ensure the priority of the elective body over the apparatus, whose staff will be hired on contract.

The plenum admitted to the FNPR regional trade union organizations of the Yakut ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and Kalinin and Smolensk oblasts in the shape of their oblast councils and also the independent RSFSR Detective Agency Workers Union.

The FNPR Council plenum adopted the resolution "The FNPR Council's Stance in Connection With the Planned Measures Pertaining to Transition to a Controlled Market Economy."

The resolution notes that the FNPR Council advocates the more radical and rapid development of the economic reform and the effective use of world experience in managing a market economy and displays a readiness to participate actively in preparatory work and make a constructive contribution. However, the FNPR Council considers impermissible the rash introduction of market relationships without consideration of the opinion of the unions and will strive for extensive discussion of the draft program of reforms and its fundamental propositions.

The Federation Council, the resolution observes, will insist on the legislative enshrinement of the role of the unions at republic level in the elaboration, realization, and supervision of measures pertaining to the transition to a controlled market economy and the creation for the working people and the population of firm social guarantees.

Republican People's Party of Russia Formed

WA2704192690 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 17, 25 Apr 90, p 11

[Article by I. Fonyakov: "The First-Born of the Multiparty System"]

[Text] **"A new party has been created," LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA informed its readers. The newspaper exists at present as the organ of the CPSU oblast and city party committees.**

What is this "new party" which has become the first-born, in a way, of the legal multiparty system in the city on the Neva? Its name is the "Republican People's Party of Russia" [RNPR]. Seventy-four delegates from Leningrad, Vologda, Novgorod, and Valday were present at its constituent congress. The platform of the party speaks of its intention to seek the "constitutional creation of a regime that would develop harmoniously and based on the rule of the people," and to defend "Russia's unity, sovereignty, uniqueness, and honor." The party also means "to fight against the left radicals and socio-extremists, and to help preserve the moral and religious values of the Russian Orthodox church." However, the choice of new leadership displays the ideas of the new party better than anything else. V. Antonov, the notorious activist of the Leningrad Pamyat, was elected chairman of the temporary council. N. Lysenko, whose speeches at the rallies of the same organizations in Rumyantsevskiy garden are memorable to many Leningraders, was elected deputy chairman.

Russian Christian Democratic Movement Named

WA2704192790 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 17, 25 Apr 90, p 11

[Article by V. Orlova: "The Ark Has Set Sail On the Water"]

[Text] **The constituent meeting of the new party was named by an old Russian word "Sobor" [Gathering]. The new party is the Russian Christian Democratic Movement (RKDD).**

This word can probably serve as a symbol of the entire program of the new social force. The program is to gather those around them who feel an empathy for the condition of the people's soul, for the people's morals and kindness.

RKDD has existed for a long time now. And in essence now that the multiparty system became legal the party simply came out from its long hiding into the open

political arena. While gradually gaining organizational, editorial, and economic strength and creating its own cooperatives and other commercial enterprises, it has always considered charity as the main priority of its work. The new party members are convinced of being on a par with our time, of being indispensable to our society, which has long been devoid of moral standards. They find proof of that in the evident support of their candidates by many a thousand voters at the elections for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. These candidates, now people's deputies, priests Gleb Yakunin and Vyacheslav Polosin, became cochairmen of the Movement Duma [council], as well as RSFSR People's Deputies Victor Aksyuchits and Gleb Anishchenko. Members of the RKDD adhere to democratic principles and consider democracy to be not an end but a means for providing decent existence for people.

One more thing: The movement has joined the political struggle as an official opposition to the CPSU, which holds atheism as one of its basic principles. This was decisively stated at the press conference.

So, the ark of RKDD has set sail on the water.

Russian Self-Defense in Republics Viewed

90US0850A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 18 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent V. Yurlov: "How Fellow Countrymen Live in the Outlying Areas of Our Multinational Country"]

[Text] Dushanbe-Frunze—**For a long time we were brought up in the spirit of constant readiness "to repel." Now, it appears, this readiness is being disavowed. So, will we really carry over an "image of the enemy" that has been fixed in the mass conscience into the sphere of interethnic relations?"**

I am not revealing a secret when I say that self-defense detachments succeeded in proving their effectiveness not just in Tajikistan. Diverse in their national composition, for the most part they include the so-called Russian-speaking population. And so I wonder: Will Russians really have to defend themselves just because they are Russian? How did we ever get to this kind of a life?

For a beginning, a quotation: "The first powerful offshoots of the new system were self-defense detachments—the bases of the future system of self-government of rayons and of the resolution of the most critical political and social problems. Now, the main thing is for the new democratic movement to choose the correct direction and to shift from the first defensive reaction to the search for new forms...."

This advice to the Russian-speaking population was published on the pages of the newspaper KOMMUNIST TAJIKISTANA. It belongs to a well-known scientist in the republic, and, as I now understand, in all probability a courageous person. Not many could venture to say this.

And, nevertheless, what is most unusual in the quoted words is a recognition of the fact that the self-defense detachments must become the basis of the future system of self-government. One senses that the scientist knows the subject of the discussion. But no matter how naive this seems, I want to exclaim: To what degree of wildness have we come that such advice should become a real sign of the times?

Several years ago the American scientist-demographer Demko, who is now working, it appears, as an adviser to the President, predicted the emergence in our country of 18 highly explosive spots. His predictions are gradually coming true. Of course, the awakened self-consciousness of the people of our country and the return to each nation of such great values as history, tradition, language, and culture cannot occur serenely. But why in many interethnic conflicts—whether in the Baltics or the Transcaucasus—do the Russians frequently suffer most of all? The February events in Dushanbe did not flare up suddenly or in a calm place. With all their complexity and ambiguity, there were also personal "albatrosses" here. I wrote once about how doctors of native nationality refused to help Russians who were victims of violence. The then bureau of the city party committee assessed these actions only as nonfulfillment of official duty.

The article caused a sensation. The reaction to it was ambiguous. For example, O. Latifi, present deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic, took me to task, after admitting, it is true, that he himself did not read the article. But on the other hand A. Dadabayev, secretary of the Central Committee, severely scolded the author at the ruins of the Gissar earthquake for the fact that I had dared to publicize those facts. And he tried for a long time to make me understand how deeply the ideas of internationalism were felt by the people. As if I had criticized the people rather than a heap of unrestrained renegades and the more than strange position of the party committee.

Of course the February events in Dushanbe require profound comprehension. But we can already say today that in those days, for the first time perhaps, anti-Russian attitudes let themselves be known openly and loudly. Later none of those who revolted even mentioned the Armenians, who only served as a pretext for disgraceful behavior. But, then, the Russians were punished severely. It could have been worse were it not for the self-defense detachments, in which, by the way, there were also indigenous nationalities.

One detail is typical of such events. The Tajikistan Academy of Sciences sent a touching letter to colleagues from Armenia expressing profound regrets for offense to the national feelings of a fraternal people. The initiative was supported. Voices could be heard saying that other

organizations should also send appropriate dispatches to Yerevan through their own departmental channels. And this was proper.

However, for some reason, no one even gave a thought of apologizing to the Russians. Perhaps some thought was given to this, but how was it to be done? It is as if Russia did not have an Academy of Sciences, party Central Committee, or trade union. Indeed, as if it was a kind of waning republic. On the other hand, reproaches followed that the Russians rushed out of the republic. They stressed conscience: What will happen to the republic if it is left without specialists?.. Enterprises and building projects will mount up, and Tajikistan will be unable to fulfill its contractual obligations.

A respected professor from the North Caucasus appears in one of the central newspapers, and he complains bitterly: "In the works of Russian Soviet writers that describe events of the civil war, the first five-year plans, the Great Patriotic War, and postwar construction, there has been in recent years an examination of problems of science, technology, and art, and for some reason the main characters are principally Russians."

A strange reproach, is it not? But who should act in the works of Russian writers? Chechens? Ossets? Kirghiz? However, all it took was for Viktor Astafyev to draw a portrait of one of the representatives of the Caucasian nationality without the usual dose of respect and piety, when a great fuss was immediately made! Many examples of how badly the Russian people behaved during the time of collectivization, or let us say during the mass repressions, can be found in the literature of the peoples of the USSR. And it seems that his does not trouble anyone particularly.

I know not just from hearsay with what reluctance Russian journalists investigate negative materials in which the main character is a representative of an indigenous nationality. It was not long ago, and it still goes on in some places, that the managers of different publications carefully compared the number of portraits of Russians and natives that appear in one issue. God forbid that there should be more Russians. In fact, I myself counted them when I was an editor. I will tell you, it is a humiliating undertaking....

I sense that I can be reproached here: But how many toasts were declaimed in the name of Russia in the entire preceding period! However, it was the thing to do. But while praising the Russians in words, they humiliated them continuously in deeds. For example, after analyzing the picture of the welfare of the people, Doctor of Sciences G. Litvinov showed that access to education and to the advantages of culture was not in Russia's favor by a factor of two, three, and more times. In other words, the equal among equals found itself at the tail end.

But meanwhile it should be understood that there will be no order in our multinational homeland until such time as there is order in Russia.

In those alarming days when the stream of refugees from Tajikistan increased sharply I showed, with figures in hand, that the same people were departing who not very long ago were lured into the construction of prestigious enterprises, while widely flaunting slogans about international assistance. And so, it turns out that specialists are no longer needed.... Incidentally, Russians who live outside the boundaries of Russia number more than 20 million today. This is a whole state! Indeed not one country can endure such a resettlement, if it happens suddenly and over short space of time.

Slogans with a call to liberate the republic from the Russians could also be heard in Kirghizia in the alarming January-February days. Today out of habit we try to persuade each other not to pay any attention to them: It is said that these are extremists and fanatics—every family has its black sheep. I thought the same way until recently. But then I read an article in the first issue of the journal LITERATURNYY KIRGHIZSTAN by Umutay Midinova, a young philologist, and I understood that I made a great mistake on this score.

A likable young woman (the journal carried her picture) with the self-confidence of a politician of many years of experience tries to show that the Russians are to blame for all of the troubles in the republic. They ruined the countryside with their passion for picnics, and these very same Russians, infected with the "hoarding gene," create lines. I do not exaggerate, this is the way it is written: "The war did not end for the Russians; the gene of hoarding, acquiring, and standing in lines has gotten into the blood as a certain way of life."

I will not talk about what Kirghizia represented until the arrival of the Russians—this has already become commonplace. Historically, it developed that millions of Russians turned out to be like natives in practically all Union republics. Just like representatives of other people in the Russian Federation. The old people remember how they were received, but the young people do not want to hear about it. I was told a tale in "intelligent" circles of both Kirghizia and Tajikistan as a reliable fact that apparently the Russians, frightened by the events in Central Asia, wrote a letter to Moscow, and there it was recommended they resettle in thinly populated places of Russia....

Tajikistan holds first place in the country in rates of birth, and a decreasing trend is not foreseen. But here is a paradox: At almost all new construction projects of the republic, Russians who came from all corners of the country essentially constitute the backbone of the working class. Natives of indigenous nationality are also in a minority in industrial enterprises. A prudent redistribution of the work force remains a fond dream of Gosplan (State Planning Committee]. But in the meantime there is less and less work in the villages.

The labor surplus of the population is growing. What is to be done here? And then the bright thought appeared to set up small "branches" of Tajikistan in Russia. They

decided in favor of non-Chernozem. This idea is widely propagandized in the republic. Tajik settlements are already springing up in Yaroslavl Oblast.

And one other proposal emerged recently: To send young people to vocational schools outside the borders of the republic. This method of outflow of the population and training personnel looks quite promising to today's leadership. The logic is as follows: Just move the young people outside the boundaries of the republic. And there nature will take its course. International marriages will occur, especially since bride-money does not have to be given for Russian brides. This is the nature of the "Tajik experiment." I will not try to judge how much thought went into this (this is a special discussion), but such experiments it seems to me are being conducted according to the principle: Out of sight, out of mind.

But in the meantime Tajikistan sends 6,000 young boys and girls to Russia annually. How will their fate fare, and how is it faring? But what will happen, let us assume, if they will be treated in Russia just as Russians are treated in other outlying areas of our country?

I lived in Central Asia for 40 years, and I see distinctly how the political situation has changed in a short period. Including the treatment of Russians. And, apparently, the time has come, as the philosopher Vestuzhev-Lada wrote, to tell everyone clearly that we, Russians, do not need praise or abuse above that received by various other peoples of the planet. But save us, please, from the equivocal and humiliating situation in which any talk of our long-standing Russian problems are immediately perceived as an encroachment on the proper resolution of other people's problems.

No, we do not want to prevent anyone from living honorably and fittingly in the land of their ancestors. Apparently, it is for this very reason that quite a few Russians in national republics are thinking about how to resettle on their historical native land. But to tell the truth, I fear that someone will try to stop them from doing this. And at the same time I understand: For everyone to scatter according to national quarters means that more will be lost than gained. For one can only guess what difficulties this will cause both for the resettlers themselves and for the native people in the outlying areas.

First RSFSR Deputies Congress Discussed

90UN1476A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian
11 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA special correspondents N. Fokina, Yu. Nikolayev, and A. Ryabov on SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA roundtable discussion: "We Will Stand Up For Russia"]

[Text] Irkutsk—Each day brings us closer to the First Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies. The impatience with which we are all awaiting it is understandable. We are excited and feeling the matter keenly. It is very much the wish that this congress be pivotal in the fate of the peoples of Russia and be the reference point with which its political, economic, and spiritual revival begins.

Something else is perfectly obvious, too. In order for the congress to be that consolidating basis uniting people for lofty goals, perfectly concrete steps in this direction are essential even today. The more so in that far from all the elect are evaluating the situation unambiguously and drawing adequate conclusions, as they say. And no wonder. Particularly if account is taken of the pressure of political passions which accompanied the election campaign itself. It is evident, however, and it is not abating even now, only now passions are flaring up over the upcoming Congress of People's Deputies, its preparation, its future agenda, and the formation of the new supreme authority.

And what do the people's deputies of the Russian Federation themselves think about all this? What thoughts and feelings are they taking to their first congress? These questions were put to the participants in a SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA roundtable meeting in Irkutsk. Assembled at the meeting were the Siberian RSFSR people's deputies E.D. Bartoshkin, a construction worker from Novosibirsk, I.V. Vinogradova, director of a high school from this same city, P.G. Suturin, steelworker of the Petrovsk-Zabaykalskiy Foundry, V.I. Kotelnikov, lathe hand-drill operator of the "Polet" Production Association from Omsk, B.A. Pakhtanov, first secretary of the Aginskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] (Aginskiy Buryat Autonomous Okrug), and V.N. Khayryuzov, a pilot and writer from Irkutsk. Candidate of Historical Sciences L.F. Antipin and Candidate of Legal Sciences S.N. Shishkin, yesterday's competitors for Russian deputy mandates, wanted to take part in our discussion also. R.K. Salyayev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, expressed a desire to share his hopes connected with the new Russian supreme authority....

Those assembled asked a group of USSR people's deputies to take part in the discussion in order that the former might in direct communication familiarize themselves more thoroughly with the work experience of union congresses and Supreme Soviet sessions and learn lessons from them. USSR People's Deputies A.L. Angarkhayev (Buryatia) and S.I. Kolesnikov, V.I. Potapov, V.G. Rasputin and V.P. Khmel (Irkutsk Oblast) responded to this invitation.

Lest We Take Up the Cudgels

Our meeting was held without any predetermined agenda, without set rules. Each participant was afforded an opportunity to speak on all aspects of the preparations for the upcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and share his thoughts, intentions, and concerns. It was for this reason, evidently, of a somewhat chaotic nature. And inasmuch as there were assembled at

the "roundtable" committed people, many of whom have still not cooled down from the election struggle, there was no shortage of emotions and heated and at times, perhaps, insufficiently considered opinions. It would take several issues of the paper to reproduce them all.... A selection had to be made, naturally. And we offer readers primarily what, in the unanimous opinion of those assembled, is troubling them most, that is, the "real thing," as they say....

Of course, each participant in the exchange of opinions had his own topic, his own hobbyhorses in the speeches, but none of them avoided the pivotal issue of our times—the problem of Russian statehood and interethnic relations.

A.L. Angarkhayev: When I listen to our anthem and its words about the fact that "the union indestructible of republics free is united forever by the great Rus," I do, really, feel embarrassed. Are we not fooling ourselves? After all, there is no Rus, it has been pilfered bit by bit and torn apart. So what should we do? Correct the anthem or reality? Reality, surely. I have a great liking for the word "revival." It is a fine word and a fine concept. But when I speak about the revival of Russia, I refer mainly to the strengthening of its statehood. Because Russia is a composite of various republics and other autonomous formations. It bears historical responsibility. It is truly a family of peoples. This is how it has taken shape....

To convey his idea to those present more clearly and precisely Ardan Lopsonovich suggested a look back at history.

A.L. Angarkhayev: Let us recall! When the first Russian explorers moved toward the sun, their detachments were small. This indicates best of all that they were setting forth not to subjugate the eastern peoples but to cooperate and make friends with them. At that time my Buryat ancestors also, for example, always had an opportunity to respond severely to grossness or injustice: Essentially the detachments of explorers could not seriously have defended themselves. How Siberia would have developed in that case, we can only guess. On the other hand, it is perfectly obvious that the mutual penetration of our cultures enriched the peoples. I am convinced that if our small Siberian peoples enclose themselves within their national boundaries, they will decline into economic, cultural and other narrowness. And at the same time, on the other hand, if the outlook and religion of different peoples differ from one another, what is wrong with this? These things need to be viewed very tolerantly, intelligently, and wisely. It is this tolerance and wisdom which I expect from the Russian Congress. Primarily a strengthening of our common statehood.

V.G. Rasputin: This is all the more important inasmuch as there has been a stimulation of destructive forces of late. I recall how back at the start of the 1970s an emigre declared: "Russia is dead, it is archaeological, like Byzantium." It is that long since the talk began about the death of Russia, about the fact that it no longer exists as an independent political, economic, and social structure and that, if it is indeed still holding together, it is merely on the basis of sovereign power, nothing else remains to bind it. And certain circles have been assiduously spreading this idea since that time. Not all of you, perhaps, have seen the map produced in the West of a dismembered Russia. At the center is the state of Muscovy as it appeared under Ivan the Terrible, prior to the taking of Kazan, all the rest is composed of territorial zones for which the role of raw material appendages is in store. There is no shortage of volunteers for splitting and fragmenting us today....

B.P. Khmel: I am worried and frightened by the activity of the deputies of the so-called "Democratic Russia" bloc....

B.G. Rasputin: It is a pity that we have let these fine words and concepts be taken up by forces and that the actual persons expressing them in the new corps of deputies have highly distinctive ideas both about democracy and Russia. It is sufficient to mention here, I believe, that from the first meeting following the elections these latter-day "democrats" entirely "democratically"—by a vote—removed from the hall all correspondents. Why? To conceal from the people their true intentions?

V.P. Khmel: It is about this that I wish to speak. The methods and tricks of these "democrats" are identical to those of our interregionals. I am convinced that they will in the same way attempt to secure the votes of national deputies, as the Inter-Regional Group did at the first, second, and third congresses of USSR people's deputies in order to achieve their political ends at any price, not stopping short of inflaming nationalist and separatist sentiments....

R.K. Salyayev: Exactly! Unless we halt the centrifugal forces by intelligent state actions and enactments, we will lose our Union. We will lose a unique community of people and nations, which was shaped by history. The division could reach absurd lengths. I am often reminded in this connection of the well-known parable of how two peasants established a boundary line. They placed a heavy stone on it. The first night one neighbor moved this stone onto the plot of the other, the next night the stone moves onto the plot of the first peasant.... And there was subsequently nothing left for either of them but to take up the cudgels! So should we now be moving the stones?!

It seems to me that we should be putting everything into preventing an interethnic Bacchanalia. There is no greater concern currently than concern for the future of our fatherland and the peoples inhabiting it. And it is important for Russians in the corps of deputies to prevent arrogant positions and for all to confess one main concern. It has to be seen that such a position has

yet to be achieved in the Union parliament. Group interests there frequently prevail over all-state interests.

The Russian Parliament must call a spade a spade. We should not be afraid to speak about power here. It is a system of control. Any organism, any state disintegrates without control. I hope that the Supreme Soviet of Russia will have people who take its interests to heart, and we must support, not undermine, this power.

S.I. Kolesnikov: As a medical practitioner, I may say that there is in any biological system a goal-forming factor.... When a woman is anticipating a child, say, she is geared toward bearing it. And she knows how to do this. We, however, have set some amorphous goals, seemingly noble, seemingly democratic, but which we do not precisely specify, and [illegible] the shore toward which we should sail we remain adrift and dart from side to side. Birth is inevitable. But what will the child be like? I am for consolidation, we cannot destabilize society to the point where a clash of positions, no longer just on the principles of ideology, begins....

E.D. Bartoshkin: Dividing up Russia now? Running barbed wire between regions? Unearthing Kolchak's rifles and machine guns? Have we come to this? I believe that at the first congress we must pose the question of an indivisible and whole Russia. This is both our task and our pain.

What Kind of Parliament Is Required?

Here is an interesting point. When, prior to the start of the meeting, we were exchanging opinions, almost all the partners from the new corps of deputies focused their attention on some specific instructions of the electorate of particularly local significance. But here none of them even touched on local interests, so much had concern for the fate of Mother Russia taken possession of everyone.

In the course of the heated discussion many serviceable proposals were submitted also.

S.I. Shishkin: It is right that concern is being shown here for the need for consolidation. But how do we understand consolidation? Taking people by the hand and saying that we are united? This is not enough. Consolidation must proceed along a single channel—the strengthening of power. Real consolidation means primarily a strengthening of power economically and politically. And I would like to emphasize, what is more, not just any power but Soviet power.

Why have I brought this up? Because a very serious threat looms over Soviet Russia and over the Soviet Union—that of mobocracy. The power of the crowd—this is what mobocracy is! The last elections showed how real this threat is. This mobocracy had its producers, and they acted pushily and impudently and made extensive use of our press, radio, and television. I will say quite definitely that at the first congress those same forces will attempt to seize power. Why have we become so bashful? Why do we believe that we can only operate in white gloves? To be honest, we lack fortitude.

I.V. Vinogradova: I was convinced of this during the election struggle. We communists, raised on some extraordinarily chivalrous principles, were more often than not afraid to say even a word in support of a comrade. And there were actions of quite a different sort. In Novosibirsk, in any event, I knew candidates who attempted to buy the electorate by any method, from cheap promises to fill the stores with sausage up to and including giving students R10 bills and sending little old ladies all kinds of handouts of the handkerchief type, as long as they canvassed "for the right one."

Other, no less eloquent, instances of such activity have been cited at our meeting. Irkutsk people, for example, have complained that it reached the point of some voters being pressured with might and main as to their choice even by Western radio voices. And they were not canvassing for some beliefs in general, what is more, but naming specific candidates per territorial district of the oblast for whom, in the opinion of the prompters, unwise inhabitants of the Baykal cities and villages should vote. Certain local mass media frequently took up the refrain in unison with these radio voices. Those who were not wanted were roundly defamed....

The train, as they say, has now departed. All deputies, regardless of for what reason, by whom, and how they were elected, will be introduced at the first congress with equal rights. This is why it is now so important not to be fooled when it comes to electing the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and forming the government. And for this it is necessary to so arrange things that the RSFSR people's deputies get to know one another as much as possible prior to the congress. And not only in respect of political predilections but of human attributes also. In order not to vote blindly.

V.P. Khmel: It is good that we have come together today like this. After all, during the preparations for the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies no one found the time to organize as many of these meetings as possible so that we might get to know one another.

V.I. Potapov: Lessons also need to be learned from the practice of the Union congresses and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions themselves. It is far from my thoughts canceling out all that they have done. We have gained experience in parliamentary work and seen many interesting people, good organizers, and fellow thinkers. But, unfortunately, much that is negative also has been revealed. A particularly dispiriting impression is made by work "for public consumption." And if this is repeated, I can say plainly that the republic's highest forum will drown in organizational and procedural issues and will not get down to what is most important.

In my opinion, the congress must determine its position in respect of fundamental problems, which are a burden on the Russian Federation. And, primarily, determine

Russia's political and economic status. It should primarily possess the necessary independence and effective cooperation within the framework of the union republics and other territories. It is essential to also examine the entire set of questions connected with the restoration of social justice. After all, it ultimately needs to be shown in our multinational state who amounts to what so that we may cut our coat according to our cloth. Unless the congress does this, people will not understand it. In the course of the election campaign even we were frequently stumped in the face of the pressure of exacting questions. Try, say, intelligibly explaining to people of Irkutsk why Irkutsk Oblast is in 19th place in the country in terms of production, but in the 1970s in terms of social benefits....

S.I. Shishkin: I fear that the RSFSR people's deputies could succumb to one dangerous disease—the congress syndrome. It is perfectly obvious that we have today a double-layer pie—the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. This is an unworkable system. As a lawyer and specialist in constitutional law, I would recommend a different power structure. The formation at the Congress of People's Deputies of an energetic, efficient parliament. It is this which should examine the majority of issues. Of course, many deputies would take offense at having to withdraw into the background, as it were, and not meet in Moscow as often as Union people's deputies. But the corps of deputies—1,068 persons—is, after all, a very large, almost uncontrollable audience. Their status could be reinforced locally in order that they might prove to be at the center of political power here and help, bring into contact, say, allied authorities and head formations of deputies.

In short, I believe that we need to be absolutely clear in our understanding that only a professional RSFSR Supreme Soviet may assume the plenitude of power in Russia and decide all matters on behalf of Russians. If we leave the "two-layer pie," the deputies will nod in the direction of the Congress, wait for its decisions and, having assembled, will start political games as to when it is necessary to speak, for appearance's sake, to show oneself to one's electorate. But, of course, I, a voter, would take offense if my deputy remained silent. But does this define a deputy's mission? We have seen, unfortunately, a leader of a new quality emerging in the arena of public life—a professionally bankrupt dilettante who plays on the feelings of the crowd.

P.G. Suturin: I would very much wish to avoid appearing to be such a leader. But in order to find our place both in the work of the congress and in subsequent activity there is much that we have to understand. Primarily, where and how we can best apply our efforts.

S.I. Shishkin: An immense amount of work lies ahead for all of us. Most likely, everyone will have his own particular sphere of activity. But it is exceptionally important for everyone, I believe, to participate in most involved fashion in the renewal and restructuring of the Russian Federation. This question will arise very shortly. It will be necessary to answer it, I am convinced, at the very first congress. Politics should be of a preemptive nature. We need to take a look at our autonomous entities and lower the threshold of autonomy—create, for example, here in our oblast national associations, national autonomous rural soviets. Why not? They evolved de facto long since.

We lack, admittedly, a law on the national rural soviet. Altogether, I believe, we need within the framework of the Russian Federation republics which do not have the right of secession and which are absolutely equal. There could be quite a few such republics. What do I have in mind? It has often been the case that the nationality issue has been tackled in this legal form or the other by the voluntarist method: Some have been "given" an autonomous oblast, some an okrug, and some others a republic. In my view, the funnel should be inverted: The smaller a nationality or nation and ethnic group, the more strongly it should be protected by legal, economic, and social measures.

People took issue with Shishkin over his priorities. As a specialist in state and law, many questions were put to him. He was asked specifically:

"How, in your view, will the congress work, what surprises may be expected from it?"

S.I. Shishkin: As in the Union congress, evidently, the stumbling block will once again be the standing orders. For this reason we will need to do some good work prior to the congress. We will most likely be faced squarely with the question of a presidency. It is, in my opinion, of key significance.

"It is already being debated to the utmost among the people...."

S.I. Shishkin: The third question to which I would like to call your attention is the overhaul of the Russian Constitution. We simply cannot escape it. Russian laws, as laws of direct effect, must be of an objective-applied nature. They should not have the abstract character of USSR laws. It is necessary to give careful thought to a law on the rural, community, city, and rayon soviets. Currently they are all much of a muchness, but each one needs to adequately reflect the particular features of the territorial organization. Unless we do this, we could lose the soviet organization.

V.I. Potapov: I believe that there are sufficient sober-minded people among the RSFSR people's deputies. But, of course, the problem of self-organization will arise....

V.P. Khmel: I repeat, the majority of us USSR people's deputies went to our first congress unprepared. But the Inter-Regional Group was already united. The Baltic deputies also were in concert and had formulated their own positions and criteria. But we Siberians and Far Easterners sat and looked at one another to see what would happen next. We looked for a day or two.... And let the initiative slip away.

I.V. Vinogradova: If the same thing happens with us, this will mean just one thing: That we have, if you will excuse me, let power slip away. If we are calling the present time a revolution, we should remember also that the main question of any revolution is that of power.

A serious argument is developing as to who should head the supreme power in the RSFSR. On one thing those assembled agreed right away: This future supreme power must be able to stand up for Russia. Rebukes leveled at the USSR people's deputies because the theme of Russia was not sounded at the Union level from the very outset were heard here....

V.G. Rasputin: I accept the reproach that at the first congress the Russian deputies were unable to stand up for Russia. Frankly, we had not expected such an onslaught. We were in a state of shock virtually. We came to our senses too late. The government of Russia was unable to stand up for itself. This was permitted everyone: the governments of Georgia, Lithuania, Uzbekistan.... But if in the first days of the congress Vlasov or Vorotnikov had started to talk about Russian troubles, this would have been interpreted thus: Russia is raising its "imperial" voice.

So we found ourselves in a difficult situation. Your situation will be different, although there should be no weakening. Whereas we have had to enter into discussion, I would not call this confrontation, with the Baltic deputies, you will have to bear in mind that at the first congress patriotic Russia will come into confrontation with so-called "democratic" Russia. Those who are prepared to accept a split, whatever, as long as they can get a grip on power. You will further experience group terror, when certain sentiments become predominant and confuse people. There can be no retreating here. All froth subsides in time, and another sentiment will emerge, and it will be good and creative, I believe.

Determining Priorities Correctly

Still, such unordered communication has its attractions. They include the possibility of speaking most about what is distressing, about what pains the heart.

I.V. Vinogradova: I, as a teacher, observe with alarm how we are letting values common to all mankind slip and are losing hold of the youth. It is very difficult for it to get its bearings in the tangle of our political relationships. Yet it is the youth which is becoming the main driving force of many of today's social conflicts. Remember Tbilisi, Fergana, Karabakh, the East European countries.... If we lose our hold on the youth, no power, no most considered laws will save us.

V.N. Khayryuzov: We have already lost hold of them! The Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] now is a most active force opposed to the party and the army. And for this reason, perhaps, we need to start everything from scratch. But not with appeals and slogans, of which young people have heard their fill and which now nauseate them. We can only restore the youth's trust if we work intelligently, analyze each step of ours and anticipate how our decisions will be reflected in the situation in society. Analysis and actions—these are the main fundamentals in dialogue with the youth. After all, speaking about today's youth, we are referring to Russia's future economic and moral potential.

V.I. Kotelnikov: Unfortunately, reality is serving up sufficient grounds for skepticism and nihilism. I am a nonparty individual and sincerely wish to see our Communist Party as the governing party, given the presence of many other parties—greens, reds, whites, whatever. Just as long as they have intelligent, honest people with an unsullied reputation. With us, however, the economic situation itself incites, for example, theft. The voters have already instructed me to investigate why one plant is manufacturing for foreign countries strategic metal which is in the shortest supply as part of a barter deal, which is profitable, perhaps, merely to the enterprise managers themselves. Who agreed to this? The plant director, the chief accountant.... Both are communists! What kind of moral values do they have?

A.L. Angarkhayev: An article by Academician Likhachev expressed the interesting thought that any gene is culturally and spiritually valuable and important for us all. I have always held such a view of life and spirituality. It seems to me that morality in society begins with the extent to which its sovereign leadership is moral, the extent to which the state arrangement is moral. If it is considered that our entire international community is a single family, let us recall what things are like in a real family. If one person in this house is sick, the whole family grieves. But with us for such a long time two peoples—the Azeris and the Armenians—have been in a state of war, and we have simply been unable to reconcile them....

V.G. Rasputin: You probably noticed that at the first and subsequent congresses all questions concerning culture, spirituality, and morality went by the board, as it were. They seemed so insignificant against the background of the political and economic battles. It was not simply the "residual principle of financing" which worked here but the residual principle of elementary attention: It would, allegedly, sort things out itself. But nothing happens for no particular reason, of its own accord.

To what a lack of breeding leads was shown by the last election campaign, which we all observed. It transpires that our people are quite susceptible to elemental temptation and that we bite at untenable mottoes and slogans. But it seems to me that we need to speak healthy, sober thoughts and summon the people to a working life. The bitter truth is sometimes hard to take, and just as there is a higher judgment, there is also truth, which will in time gather its supporters. And it further needs to be remembered, particularly when complaints start about Western abundance, that we are, for all that, different people and that, aside from repletion, we have always had insufficient spiritual aspiration also.

L.F. Antipin: Yet how much has already been said about the appalling state of our culture and public education! It seems to me that as long as the sphere of public education is in the doldrums and until it becomes the instigator and progenitor of progressive ideas, we will restore nothing in the way of morality and culture. It is necessary everywhere to affirm the high spiritual purpose of the teacher, the true intellectual and zealot and render them by all possible means at the most diverse levels strong support. We should not stint on kind words in the newspaper and on television. Otherwise we will simply remain at a standstill. And the adolescent and young man will, as before, be squandered and will be nobody's.

Of course, our day-to-day problems were not overlooked during the keen and emotional discussion either, and the economy was subjected to a stringent and exacting analysis.

P.G. Suturin: Perestroyka and radical economic reform have still done nothing for either the worker or the peasant. Much is being spoken about man, but things are getting no better for him, alas. How to break the circle of blather and get down to actual business? I believe that doing this without those who produce material wealth, that is, without us, is impossible. But I am worried that it is us workers who have been greatly disparaged. What names have we not been called! Scullery kids, Sharikov's....

This is very offensive. I know that the peasant feeds 50 persons, but the worker today processes, nonetheless, for 70.... So it would seem that the working man should have priority in all things everywhere. But where is he? Once again we are hearing increasingly often that the Russian clod works badly. No, he has not begun to work less well. He has simply become quicker on the uptake: You cannot process for and feed everyone. Neither the 15 Union republics nor Mother Russia are within the powers of the working man alone. We are simply unwilling to understand that it should be a question of whoever produces something receiving something for it. Money should be earned, not obtained. With us, however, it is the other way around. It is by no means those who by their labor create all the wealth of the state who live more prosperously, but rather those who act as a variety of brokers and whose position is somewhere on the fringes. People see this and are going to earn money in cooperatives and services and in trade and are learning how to act craftily and cheat.

A tense silence descended on the room. Nor could the Transbaykal steelworker immediately get a grip on the emotion which had seized him.

P.G. Suturin: Our congress and the Supreme Soviet which we will elect are obliged, I believe, to halt the rapid growth in the subsistence minimum. I, for example, live from wage packet to wage packet. I have no investments. People are now starting to think up five-percent loans.... For whom? I shall not purchase them. Perhaps I have not worked well enough? Or, rather, have simply not hit on the "right track." Failed to find the "track" of our life where it is possible to earn honestly and correctly. Before our very eyes the honest working man is becoming the odd man out.

There were many further grievances and proposals expressed, both in the course of our general discussion and during an exchange of opinions tete-a-tete.

Those gathered at the "roundtable" proposed that no special resolutions be formulated. Merely a decision to support the "Statement of USSR People's Deputies" who participated in the meeting in Tyumen on 20-21 October 1989 was adopted unanimously. It was agreed also to support and develop the cooperation of the Union and republic Siberian deputies. And each most likely drew certain conclusions for himself also.

Moscow Deputies Form Democratic Russia Bloc

WA0705190890 Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 9 Apr 90 p 1

[Statement by a group of people's deputies on the formation of the "Democratic Russia" bloc: "The City Is for the People"]

[Text] The Moscow Soviet people's deputies who were part of the election candidates who formed the "Democratic Russia" bloc, and some deputies sharing their political views, formed a bloc of Moscow Soviet deputies of the same name—"Democratic Russia." At present the bloc is made up of the majority of the Moscow Soviet deputies—281 out of the 463 elected.

Bloc membership is voluntary and open to any deputy willing to participate in its work. In the bloc there are non-party members as well as members of the CPSU and other political organizations. The bloc participants are united only by common ideas and there is no political organ at the head of it. A coordination council was chosen to organize the activities of the bloc. The work of every bloc member as a Moscow Soviet deputy is guided entirely by his convictions and by his understanding of the wishes of the people, which is especially true when voting at the sessions and in the commissions of the Moscow Soviet. On certain occasions when the Moscow Soviet is discussing some problems vital for Moscow and for the Muscovites the bloc members work out solutions to these problems at their own meetings. However, these decisions are not obligatory for bloc members. To prepare bloc documents working groups are set up and any bloc member can participate in them.

Our main goal is to create conditions in Moscow which will ensure the genuine rule of the people in the name of a decent life for them. We think that the interests of an individual are more important than those of the state, of any party, or of any social or other group. It is not people that should govern us but stable laws based on the principles of civilized jurisprudence which would make it possible to create the conditions for realizing the natural processes of social development. We stand

against the monopoly on power; we are ready to cooperate with those who represent all constructive political forces and with all the blocs and groups of deputies in the Moscow Soviet. However, we aim to put into effect our own program which is based on general political principles of the bloc and on the deputies' campaign programs and the wishes of the constituency.

We intend to ensure that all political parties as well as public, religious, and other organizations acting within the framework of the Constitution have equal rights for their activity in Moscow. We will take a decisive stand against any instigation of interethnic feuding or any signs of discrimination for ethnic reasons. We intend to create conditions in Moscow which would allow the realization of the laws on property, on land, on leasing, and on leasing arrangements as well as other legislative acts on radical reforms of economic relations. Business enterprise will enjoy our support and protection. We will pay special attention to the problems of social justice, to immediate measures on the improvements in health care, to a resolution of residential problems, to the fight against crime, to food supplies and bringing some order into trade, and the ecological improvements in Moscow. The deputies of the "Democratic Russia" bloc will use every way to promote the development of science, culture, and arts as the basis for a moral and spiritual revival of the society.

The people of Moscow are expecting decisive actions and practical results from us. We are prepared to justify these expectations, even though we realize that the efficiency of our efforts depends to a large extent on the correlation of forces at the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] congresses of people's deputies. It also depends on the state of progressive reforms in the country which can be ensured mostly by the people. Muscovites! We rely on your support.

[signed] People's deputies of the Moscow city council who belong to the "Democratic Russia" bloc.

First Session of Leningrad Oblast Soviet Held

90US1654A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 p 1

[Report by Z. Fedorova and A. Filimonov: "Whose Program Is Better?"]

[Text] Two items were added to the agenda right away due to the amendments proposed by the deputies of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet on the first day of the session. It became clear that the time initially scheduled for the work of the session would not be sufficient. The newly elected deputies, who account for an overwhelming majority here, need time in order to get acquainted and acquire at least some experience.

Looking back, we would like to confirm that a discussion on the chairmen and the composition of permanent deputy commissions started on the first day and was not completed until the second. The deputies approached the formation of these organs very thoroughly and seriously. This is understandable: After all, the routine, labor-intensive, mundane work which will ultimately determine the results of activities of the entire oblast soviet will proceed in these very commissions. It is important not to make a mistake in this sphere. However, frankly speaking, it was striking that several deputies undertook to serve on two commissions at once voluntarily, without this being foisted on them. You will understand that this means double the workload. We would very much like to believe that those who, as they say, take the bull by the horns will get a greater charge of energy. This is what soviet power in the oblast needs greatly at this point.

Yesterday, the morning began with the meetings of permanent commissions. Many of them continued to familiarize themselves with the operation of "their" departments and services of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee]. Perhaps, agrarian deputies were the only exception: They gathered together despite the fact that many of them serve on different commissions. What was the reason for the gathering of this group of deputies? In brief—they wanted to listen to the people who had been nominated candidate chairmen of the oblast soviet. This was a prelude of sorts to a serious discussion at the session. After all, elections of the oblast soviet chairman are a special matter. It is no accident that the discussion on this matter began long before the official debate.

An invitation to attend the meeting of the agrarian deputy group came as a surprise to Chairman of the Leningrad Oblispolkom Yu.F. Yarov. However, he saw fit to meet with them. This was mutually advantageous. The 10-minute time limit fixed for presentations by contenders for the credentials of chairman may not have satisfied all of them. Meanwhile, here the candidates had an opportunity to discuss their programs in a less formal and more extensive manner and respond to all questions put by the deputies. There was no dearth of questions. Let us quote only the ones we find the most interesting.

—What task does Yarov consider to be paramount for the oblast soviet?

—To equalize the living conditions of the Leningraders and the residents of the oblast. Yuriy Fedorovich went on to outline his concept. In his opinion, the primary cause of troubles is in the fact that an equivalent exchange between Leningrad and the oblast has long been disrupted. This is manifested with particular acuity in the construction industry. After the formation of the Leningrad Construction Committee, its employees reassigned their main resources to the Leningrad projects, virtually leaving construction in the oblast to its own devices. In rural areas alone about 240 million rubles were not utilized due to this. Clubs, residential houses, hospitals—this is what the rural residents failed to receive due to the monopoly of the Leningrad Construction Committee.

This is not an isolated case but a reflection of the overall situation that has emerged in the socioeconomic development of the oblast. Food processing enterprises, local industry enterprises, and branches of various Leningrad organizations operate on its territory. They generate considerable profits which they transfer to their parent agencies rather than to the local budget. This is exactly why the soviets are like poor relations and have difficulty making both ends meet.

With the advent of the Law on Local Self-Government, the soviets need to take power in its entirety. In the process, all powers need to be delegated to the lower echelons who are closer to the people than anyone else and know better their requirements and needs. We should seek to ensure that additional products made in the rayon remain there rather than get shipped elsewhere as the ministries wish, as is often the case at present with agricultural products.

In response to numerous questions asked by agrarian deputies, Yu.F. Yarov stressed that the time has come to regard Leningrad and the oblast as a unified socioeconomic organism and, figuratively speaking, not to hog the covers. Life itself is prompting the deputy corps of the oblast and city soviets and their apparatuses to join forces. It will be extremely difficult to solve the problems accumulated in the region effectively in the absence of such cooperation.

S.P. Kolomeytsev, general director of the "Nevskaya Dubrovka" Furniture Production Association, also was among those invited to the meeting of the agrarian group of deputies. Stepan Pavlovich also was a contender for the credentials of chairman and sought proponents and like-minded people on the basis of his program. Despite the latter being more laconic than the program of Yu.F. Yarov, it was received with interest and appreciation. In the opinion of the deputies themselves, the chapter that discusses the accelerated construction of assembled houses produced by "Nevskaya Dubrovka" in rural areas attracted their attention. The agrarian deputies duly appreciated the concept of S.P. Kolomeytsev proceeding from the bitter experience of the past when central villages of many kolkhozes [collective farms] with their "five-story units" began to look like twins and left many rural residents unwilling to take up auxiliary farming. Deputy V.S. Karapetyants, general director of the Sovkhoz [State Farm] Association "Syaglitsy," observed correctly that the assembled houses are a way to retain cadres in rural areas, as well as an additional source of foodstuffs.

What will the renewed soviet of people's deputies of our oblast and its apparatus become? This issue is still to be resolved. However, the deputies learned what it has been until now from a report by V.I. Parotikov, chief of the Oblispolkom Finance Administration. Here are just a few numbers: There are 179 people in its apparatus; R1,261,000 are spent annually to maintain it (of which R783,000 in salaries). It should be mentioned that salaries have recently increased by 21.8 percent on the average.

The deputies have yet to determine whether they want to leave the entire apparatus intact. However, one thing is obvious: There will be no subsidies for the newly formed soviet; its cadres and salaries should be drawn from the current staff and wage funds.

Now about the further course of events at the session.

Understandably, nominating candidate chairmen of the oblast soviet of people's deputies became the main event. The deputies added one more contender to those named above—V.P. Yesinovskiy, chairman of the Kirishskiy Rayon Committee for Environmental Protection. It seemed that there was no end indeed to questions put to every candidate in turn. However, not one question caught the contenders unprepared, even those that were, as they say, "trick questions." Thus, Yesinovskiy was asked:

—What position will you give to Yarov if you become chairman of the soviet?

—I will nominate him ispolkom chairman.

—How do you view the fact that the residents of Tosnenskiy Rayon did not support your candidacy for the position of chairman of Tosnenskiy Soviet?

—Where there is struggle someone must lose.

The debate was prolonged, but still the program of Yu.F. Yarov attracted the greatest attention of the deputies due to being detailed, thought-out, and constructive. It was given preference.

Yuriy Fedorovich Yarov, 48, was elected chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies yesterday by a secret vote.

More on Session

90UN1658B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by E. Fedorova and A. Filimonov: "Without Indulgences"]

[Text] If two years ago deputies of the oblast soviet had been told that their next session would continue for three days in a row they would probably have been disturbed: Three days are out of the question when everything has ground to a halt in the rural areas. Taking their many years of experience into account, workers of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee] allotted two days even for today's session—the first of the new convocation: They were counting on the fact that the regulations had been drawn up and this was the amount of time for which the hotel rooms had been ordered for those who needed them. But yesterday the session of the oblispolkom ran for the third day and the end was still not in sight.

So one wants to ask what has changed. Perhaps the oblast has become different? Or are there extraordinary problems which require immediate solutions?

We would answer these questions differently—different people have come to the soviet. And along with them there are the circumstances, a kind of vital interest in the changes for the better. We dare say it is as if there were a spirit of independence in the hall, a certain emancipated and businesslike atmosphere. Nobody here is indifferent.

But let us return to the meeting. We have already reported that late in the evening before it the results of the secret voting in the elections of the chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies became known. Yu.F. Yarov was elected.

Yesterday's meeting began with him as chairman. And we wish to express our opinion: From the first minutes of the third day the meetings of the session were appreciably more organized, more efficient, and we would say more democratic. There was immediately more order, consistency, and harmony among the deputies in the hall. Perhaps this is partially because when beginning the meeting the chairman congratulated two deputies on their birthday. Nobody expected this, but it lent a nice touch.

The practical work of the day began with the nomination of the chairman of the oblast people's control committee. On behalf of the presidium of the soviet Yu.F. Yarov suggested that this post be filled by S.G. Petrov, who today works as secretary of the Leningrad City Party Committee. Until quite recently this position was a stepping stone when a person was being nominated to any post whatever. Now everything has changed and the few minutes he spent at the podium under a barrage of questions from the floor, one must assume, were not at all easy. Although it was obvious that the candidate had the information and the qualities of an organizer, he also had his own opinions on various issues. The deputies wanted to be convinced that they were electing to the committee a person who was worthy—someone competent, principled, and objective. And, having been convinced, they showed him their preference by a majority of votes.

Longer debates flared up concerning V.A. Zubkov, who was running for the position of the Leningrad Oblispolkom. In his program Viktor Alekseyevich concentrated attention on the way the agroindustrial complex would be tomorrow and the paths he sees to a point where residents of the oblast would be provided with plenty of food products. He discussed this knowledgeably as the deputy chairman of the Leningrad Oblispolkom in charge of this branch.

Many deputies saw that Zubkov had made a strategic omission in posing the question this way. Their remarks essentially amounted to one thing: The chairman of the executive committee of the oblast soviet should have a broader view and not limit himself to one sphere of production, albeit an important one.

The course of the polemics was not affected by a clarification from Yu.F. Yarov to the effect that the candidate for the chairman's mandate had spent almost all his life working with agriculture and has a reputation as an energetic and businesslike person and a skilled leader. The deputies expressed their opinions during the voting when only 64 people supported Zubkov's candidacy. So the soviet made a significant adjustment to the formation of the new apparatus.

Yesterday they approved the deputy chairmen of the oblast people's control committee (A.G. Bogachev and N.T. Vasilyev). Additionally, they approved the chief state arbitrator of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast (L.K. Grigoryeva) and her deputies. And also the chairman of the city and rayon people's courts and the composition of the courts.

Let us make a clarification to the report published yesterday. In it we included Deputy V.P. Yesinovskiy in Tosnenskiy Rayon although he was elected in Kirshi. Neither residents of the rayon nor the soviet itself support his candidacy for the post of chairman of the city soviet.

Session Ends

90UN1663A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Is It Hard To Become a Boss?"]

[Text] The constituents must be somewhat dissatisfied with the mass media reporting from the session if they keep calling the "contact number." Such calls continuously come in to the Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom [executive committee], and each call is interesting in its own way. Leningrader A. Ilyin said that he prefers to watch the broadcasts from the Leningrad Oblast soviet session, and then he asked where and what the deputies ate. Some people might consider this question petty, if not absurd, compared to most serious problems discussed by the people's deputies, but we detected in it the unceasing attention that people pay to every facet of their deputies' lives.

Here is our answer. They eat here, in the Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom building. There are no extravagant dishes on the tables or any rare food that is in great demand elsewhere. There are soft drinks, coffee, the usual pastry, and sandwiches with sausage from a cooperative store. In other words, there are all the same things that many Leningraders eat also. The Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom employees eat here too, together with the deputies.

A different question—from a different sphere of interest: "What kind of government it is going to be if the deputies very often cannot govern themselves?" asks A. Torkov, either in indignation or as a warning.

True, at the beginning emotions at the session were almost at a boiling point. But from meeting to meeting the deputies gradually became calmer. However, the chairman still happens to reproach some of them as they ask or offer something in a tactless manner. From different points in the audience we witnessed as it happened more and more seldom. It seems that the guests invited to the session were the ones who got most upset about such attacks. Among them were candidates for head of administration jobs, and they had to pass the deputies test.

This was the last item on the agenda: approval of the heads of main administrations, administrations, departments, and committees of the Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom. It probably was also the hardest and most responsible item. They had to endorse people who can be trusted with management jobs. Honestly speaking, we would not want to be in the place of those who yesterday had to go up the steps to the podium. Hands would go up immediately in various parts of the hall and there was no end to the questions.

"How to ensure fair distribution of supplies for the oblast population again? It is so different from the way it happens in Leningrad."

"When will there be only one single organization responsible for trade in rural areas?"

Such were the questions to N.N. Antonov, head of the main administration for trade and public eating facilities.

"How do you envision a village house? Don't you think that multi-storey buildings are not all that convenient in the village, apart from the fact that they spoil the landscape?" they asked A.Ts. Dychinskiy, head of the main administration for architecture and city planning.

"What do you think about medical cooperatives? They do not do much good, but qualified people are leaving the hospitals."

That was a question to A.Ya. Grinenko, head of the health care administration.

They pass the portable microphone from hand to hand and there are questions, questions, and more questions. There are also opinions, very often totally opposing each other. One can hear this also: "The candidate does not comply with the requirements." But in a few minutes the chairman is given a phone message: "We do not agree with the deputy who just spoke. We as experts support the candidate." Such were the battles of yesterday.

The list of heads of administrations approved by the session will be published in our newspaper in the next issue.

Now we want to inform you who was chosen as the Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom deputy chairmen. A.V. Kononov was approved as the first deputy chairman and head of the planning commission; another first deputy chairman is V.A. Zubkov; deputy chairmen are N.K. Laychukovskiy, N.P. Moskovkin, and B.V. Ulyanov. V.N. Vorozheykin became the head of the Leningrad Oblast soviet ispolkom administration of affairs.

The session finished rather late last night as the deputies decided finally to complete the discussion of all the items. And they did.

The session of the oblast soviet ended its work.

Deputies View Session

90UN1663B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by Z. Fedorova and A. Filimonov: "Such Different Expectations"]

[Text] **A 20-minute break is announced and the halls and staircase landings fill with people at once. They start an emotional discussion of what they just heard and share opinions. Let us approach the deputies and ask them just one question: "What is your evaluation of the session and what are its results going to be, in your view?"**

D.V. Silayev, secretary of the "Vsevolozhskiy" sovkhoz [state farm] party committee: These five days of the first session opened my eyes to many things. Honestly speaking, I was prejudiced coming here; I was sure that I would meet a bunch of bureaucrats incapable of understanding our village problems or sharing our concerns. But the more time I spent at the session the more convinced I became that they understood us perfectly well and, what is more, were ready to do everything possible to help us.

And our sovkhoz need urgent help: Our people are leaving, there is a shortage of hands. The reason for this is our inability to provide them with living quarters. Young people try to tolerate this for a while, but then they put their letters of resignation on my desk. And any Leningrad factory will provide them with some space in their dormitory.

Another serious problem we have is decreasing vegetable planting, which we have done over the past three years. We plant only a third the vegetables than before—4,000 tons instead of 12,000 tons. And that is because we cannot manage to harvest everything by ourselves. Last fall we put effort into asking Leningraders to come and help us, but some of the crops still remained under snow.

So, let us try to figure out what is more to our advantage: empty store shelves or trips to the sovkhoz fields to help the village? I think that this is a problem not only for our sovkhoz. Consumers have already felt in their pocketbooks what it means to buy fruits and vegetables sold at contract prices. My biggest wish is that this problem be not simply discussed but solved sensibly.

V.L. Khitrin, a department head of the Kirishi trucking facility: In my opinion, Oblast Soviet Chairman Yarov

proved himself during the session as a real political leader. I know that some of the deputies do not share my view. That was also clear during the session when I was told that the oblast soviet is not a political organ and cannot have any political leaders. I radically disagree with this concept.

We still live by the illusions and dogmas of the past, which we cannot shake off. I do not mean just myself and my colleagues—the deputy corps—but I also mean a major part of the voters. They see the activity of the oblast soviet as a distributing function. But its main task is totally different: It can multiply the riches through its power and strength but it cannot distribute them. We will gain this opportunity only when we acquire freedom in the widest meaning of the world with the help of real political leaders. Then finally every person's work will become free. The sooner we understand and achieve this, the faster we will get out of the crisis.

New Leningrad Oblast Soviet Chief Profiled

90UN1658A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1

[Interview with Yu.F. Yarov, chairman of the Leningrad Oblast soviet, conducted during unspecified soviet session recess, by unidentified LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents: "Brush Strokes in the Portrait of the Chairman"]

[Text] **Congratulating Yu.F. Yarov on his election to the post of chairman of the oblast soviet, our correspondents received a brief interview from him during the recess from the session.**

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] Is Yarov the former chairman of the Leningrad ispolkom [executive committee] in any way different from the Yarov who has become chairman of the oblast soviet?

[Yarov] He must change radically. Perestroyka, which is taking place in all spheres of life, cannot but affect the soviets. If you have noticed, they have been radically updated not in a matter of days but in a matter of hours. I have seen how indecisively many newly elected deputies initially crossed the threshold of House of Soviet on Suvorovskiy. And now this indecisiveness is disappearing before our eyes and being replaced by reasonable, businesslike, and responsible decisionmaking.

Yes, today the deputies want to figure everything out and go into the essence of everything themselves. They are no longer the same "people's favorites" who were frequently under the thumb of the ispolkom apparatus and were obedient extras when various issues were raised. And even if they do not yet have enough experience in parliament or competence, they boldly enter into any sphere of our diverse life, not believing that there are any forbidden subjects.

Take today's session. In the first minutes of its work the deputies clearly announced that the functions of the apparatus would be essentially changed as, incidentally, the apparatus itself would be changed as well. Now will its help they will carry out the will of their constituents. I am deeply happy with these democratic changes. And as chairman of the oblast soviet I am called upon to contribute more actively to these changes.

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] And are you not frightened, Yuriy Fedorovich, by the fact that on the wave of these changes there is a breaking up of the deputy corps—if not into factions then into informal groups or schools?

[Yarov] I am not afraid because that process is natural. I do not see anything bad in the fact that people are joining together according to profession, social orientation, or anything else. What they are suggesting is much more important. If the deputies suggest a piece of business, I am interested in that and not in whether they are "green" or anything else. And I can assume that the person who was your opponent yesterday will suddenly become your ally today and, possibly, vice versa. This is the dialectic of life and we must consolidate forces on the basis of this.

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] Do you easily take offense?

[Yarov] Not that I have noticed, why?

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] We simply recall when it was suggested that you be elected to the post of soviet chairman and one of the deputies stated that it would be better to look for a candidate in the Leningrad City soviet....

[Yarov] You know, essentially he did not offend me. He offended mainly the deputies of his oblast soviet by expressing a lack of confidence in them. We shall consider it a pure misunderstanding. And I am ready to repeat once again that we now have gathered in the oblast soviet worthy people who have honorably made their way through the difficult election marathon and are capable of solving the most difficult problems.

Our Reference Note

Yu.F. Yarov was born in 1942. After completing the Technological Institute imeni Lensovet he worked as a shift chief, engineer-designer, and shop chief at a Baltic plant. Beginning in 1968 he worked for eight years at the Gatchina Burevestnik plant where he was elected secretary of the party committee. Subsequently he was confirmed as chief of the industrial transportation division of the Gatchina party gorkom [city committee]. Two years later he returned to the Burevestnik plant as director. He holds 11 author's certificates of invention.

In 1985 Yu.F. Yarov was elected first secretary of the Gatchina CPSU gorkom.

Since July 1987 he has been deputy chairman of the ispolkom of the oblast soviet of people's deputies. In the summer of 1989 he became chairman of the Leningrad Oblast ispolkom.

New Leningrad Oblast Chairman Profiled

90UN1659B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 1

[Report on interview with L.A. Koykolaynen, new chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet Ispolkom, by LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents Z. Fedorova and A. Filimonov: "Touching Upon the Chairman's Portrait"]

[Text] **Personal Data**

L.A. Koykolaynen was born in 1931. He started work as a fitter in a Tikhvin artel and later in the Kirishi lumber industry enterprise. For many years after his life was tied to Kirishi. At the age of 27 he became an instructor for a Kirishi CPSU Raykom [rayon party committee]. Later he was elected secretary of the party committee at construction trust No. 49 of the Main Administration for Construction in the Western Regions. This trust built practically all of Kirishi.

For two years after that Lev Alekseyevich worked as the senior foreman of the trust mechanization section. In 1965 he was elected chairman of the Kirishi Rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] and two years later—chairman of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee]. All in all he was at the head of the Kirishi Soviet for eight years. After that he was appointed first secretary of the Kirishi CPSU Gorkom [city party committee].

For two years after this L.A. Koykolaynen was in charge of the construction department of the Leningrad Obkom [oblast party committee].

Since 1978, for 12 years now, he has worked in the oblast soviet of people's deputies. He has held positions of deputy chairman, first deputy chairman, and chairman of the planning commission.

After our correspondents congratulated L.A. Koykolaynen on his election as chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet Ispolkom [executive committee] they asked him some questions:

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] Lev Alekseyevich, why did you not try to run for the post of the Leningrad Oblast Ispolkom chairman during the very first days of the session?

[Koykolaynen] Now that we are getting rid of stereotypes and many things are changing right in front of our eyes we have to reappraise our values. In the many years that I had spent working for the oblast soviet I had formed certain opinions of its activity. And now I had to amend them as the deputy corps has much harder requirements for the bureaucrats and for the Leningrad Oblast Ispolkom chairman in particular. I have to admit that I had quite a few reservations before I decided to run for the chairman's position.

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] Now, that you have been elected chairman, what are your priorities?

[Koykolaynen] The priorities are defined by the administrative power of the soviet and we are the executive power. We try to use the numerous suggestions and recommendations of new deputies and on their basis design a program of action enveloping various areas of our life. We tried to create a complex and balanced approach to the program, rather than an eclectic one. First we should get fully involved in the solution of the problems concerning everyone: putting the food program into practice, accelerating residential construction, consumer goods production, ecology. These are strategic directions for our future work and they will require our maximum effort and enthusiasm.

[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA] Could you tell us about these directions in more detail?

[Koykolaynen] As for the food program, we will try to apply it based on the development of all forms of property with equal conditions for all of them. The sovkhozes [state farms] will remain the main link in agricultural production but we will also provide strong help to the lease holders and cooperators; we will encourage mutual enterprises and associations and farms. Each of these units can be efficient only if it can use intensive technologies and auxiliary industries. We have something to rack our brains over here.

The residential program will not be any easier to realize. We named it: "Family—Apartment—House." Suffice it to say that we need to have 100,000 apartments built during the 13th five-year period. That figure is 26 percent higher than the one for the previous five years. For that we have to increase the capacity of our construction industry as quickly as possible. In particular, we have to reconstruct the three functioning house building combines; we have to ensure the introduction of new facilities in Vyborg, Vsevolozhsk, Kingisepp, and Roshchino. After we resolve the residential problem a lot of other problems, closely related to it, will be eliminated too, believe me.

From the multitude of ecological problems I would single out the ones that relate to the Ladoga basin. This situation is unique due to the fact that it is polluted not only by Leningrad industries, but also by Karelian and Novgorod industries. That means we have to look for the solution all together by designing a system of concrete measures.

I want to conclude by emphasizing that from the very beginning in our work we have tried to set up close contacts with the Leningrad Soviet deputies and with the ispolkom, which they have yet to approve.

Leningrad City Soviet First Session Viewed

90UN1654B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 p 1

[Report by V. Kovshanets and O. Ozhegov: "What Is the Inheritance?"]

[Text] "Comrade deputies! We are broadcasting live. TV viewers are dissatisfied with you getting distracted. They are looking at you! The press center."—this notice appeared yesterday in the foyer of the Mariinskiy Palace approximately one and a half hours after the proceedings of the Leningrad Soviet session under way here began.

Putting it bluntly, TV viewers, especially those who expect the deputies to respond quickly to the most burning issues in the life of the city, had reason to be dissatisfied. In our first report from the Mariinskiy Palace we likened the work of the session to a lesson of democracy of sorts which applies equally to deputies, voters, and us, journalists. We will repeat today: It would be a mistake to demand that the deputies, an overwhelming majority of whom have not previously worked in elected organs, become professional parliamentarians right away.

However, in all honesty, the first hour of yesterday's meeting resembled a class in which everyone is involved in all kinds of things except the main subject of study, if any class at all. It is not surprising that within one hour the session only managed to elect its cochairmen, of which they now have as many as three.

It so happened that during this hour we were next to a team of TV journalists and could observe our colleagues getting nervous:

"Why are they wasting time? After all, the people will turn off their TV sets, and later it is not going to be easy to make them believe that the session does transact business."

Yes, there also is this aspect of the issue which the deputies should not forget. This is to say nothing about time being really dear, and the time the deputies have not being short. A report on the socioeconomic situation of Leningrad made by V.Ya. Khodyrev, chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee] of the Leningrad soviet (he has not surrendered his powers yet), provided further evidence of that. Naturally, he only managed to touch briefly on some aspects of life in our city of 5 million during his 25-minute presentation. However, what he said was enough to understand that Leningrad, like our country, is facing an extremely grave crisis. The issue of providing foodstuffs, consumer goods, and housing for Leningraders is still acute. Health care has been neglected; no way to control crime has been found. Despite a number of specific, practical measures taken recently by the Leningrad soviet and its ispolkom with a view to getting rid of some of the worst "bottlenecks" in the life of the city which, in the opinion of V.Ya. Khodyrev, will bring due results very shortly, the inheritance the new city soviet is getting will definitely be very difficult. There can be no procrastination in putting the city in order, all the more so because the responsibility for it devolves on a single master now, the Leningrad soviet.

This was confirmed once again by USSR People's Deputy B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU Committees, who greeted the participants in the session. He said that the deputies, if they so wish, would always find good friends, assistants, and advisers in the oblast and city committees of the party and the Leningrad party organization. However, the Leningrad soviet will have to act on its own.

It goes without saying that the significance of continuity and the ability to use the already available experience knowledgeably and with enthusiasm increases greatly under the circumstances. Incidentally, USSR People's Deputy A.A. Sobchak talked about this very convincingly on the first day of the proceedings of the session. This is what compels us to recall this at present.

It should be said that V.Ya. Khodyrev did not organize his presentation quite fortunately, being reluctant or unable to take into account the attitude of the audience to which he spoke. One thinks that he need not have endlessly reminded the deputies, still somewhat high-strung after the election struggle and charged to the limit with the irritation of their voters, that the ispolkom has done everything it could for Leningraders.

However, some of the questions addressed to V.Ya. Khodyrev were not worded properly either. Some of them really betrayed the thoughtless desire to brush aside everything that has been done before. But is such an approach justified, and will it be productive?

Alas, the representatives of the people at times continued to feel that they are participants in the preelection struggle when they furiously combated their political opponents and offered declarations, statements, and manifestoes with little concern for the parliamentary style of discussion.

However, the time when programs had to be "sketched" politically is now gone, and the time has come to implement them. Apparently, former opponents will have to relegate "the fury of combat" to the past, to leave the past as inheritance for the historians, and embark on business cooperation in the interests of the voters. After all, all of them are "our people," our fellow Leningraders.

Following a speech by USSR People's Deputy N.V. Ivanov at the session, who stated that glasnost "is being gagged" "by the socially dangerous power of the Kremlin leaders," the deputies spared no time to discuss the legitimacy of canceling the appearance of the investigator for particularly important cases on Leningrad TV. After the debate, they agreed on the wording "the session insists." A majority voted in favor.

Really, nobody has a right to question the aspiration of the deputies to consider all issues, including who is going to speak on Leningrad TV and when, all the more so when a routine sort of administrative decision has social ramifications. However, there indeed are other, significant, more "glaring" problems in our city which need to be analyzed by the deputies in detail right now, and on which specific action should be taken.

Following the mayor, A.B. Chubays, chairman of the Leningrad Socioeconomic Association and candidate of economic sciences, referred to these problems from the podium. In his report "On Measures of the USSR Government Aimed at Switching to a Planned-Market Economy" the scientist did not at all conceal forthcoming tremendous difficulties which the citizens will inevitably experience during the introduction of a market economy. Of course, it may be regrettable that the scientist's speech turned out not to relate to our city. It is good that this presentation was complemented with Leningrad material at least to some degree by the representative of the Association of Industrial Enterprises of Leningrad V.P. Zanin, general director of the Scientific Production Association "Signal" and candidate of economic sciences.

We could not but notice how seriously and with what proprietary interest the deputies received the quite justified and well-grounded predictions and warnings of the scientists.... There were problems and questions.... We repeat that not one of them can be postponed until tomorrow; immediate decisions are needed.

Meanwhile, the representatives of the people are awaiting the confirmation of their credentials by the credentials commission, which has inherited dozens of protests and conflicts from the city election commission.

Member of the commission A.Yu. Patiyev said: "We are trying to consider them competently and quickly in order for the deputies to finally acquire the powers to resolve the key issues that appear on the agenda....

Session Continues

WA0905192690 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by A. Ozhegov: "Different, But Very Important"]

[Text] Is it hard to be the leading cochairman at a Leningrad City Soviet session? Both the people's deputies who have already performed this duty, Professor V.Z. Vasilyev and V.V. Shtager, a junior researcher of the "GIPKH" science and production association, agreed that this job is now much easier than at the very beginning of the city parliament session. The people's deputies finally approved time limits for the speakers during the fifth day of the session.

One remembers what V.I. Lenin said about the advocates of radical "innovations." "You should not start all over again or reconstruct everything left and right," warned Vladimir Ilich, "but you should use to the fullest what has been created already." We need to have as little hasty general restructuring [perestroyka] as possible but we also need as many businesslike, practical, tested, and proven measures, ways, and means as possible."

It seems the words of Lenin are quite in keeping with our perestroyka times.

Yes, the deputies decided on time limits, but it was not so easy to veer the discussion into the channel of established regulations and norms. They could not do it without taking a vote of confidence in the above mentioned cochairman V.V. Shtager. At one moment there seemed to be the danger of rally-like emotions igniting again in the Bolshoy hall of the Mariinskiy palace. But it did not happen. The chairman read the telegram from M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. It informed the audience about the arrival in Leningrad of the State Committee special commission which will consider the rights of the Leningrad City Soviet and Leningrad Oblast Soviet to TV broadcasting. Naturally, it was decided that the problems which had nearly caused a parliamentary crisis should be discussed together with the city and oblast deputies' commissions, and correspondents and employees of the Leningrad TV.

"We have to listen to public opinion," A.S. Yezhelev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Journalists Union Leningrad Branch, emphasized at the session. He told the deputies about the decision of the extraordinary meeting of the oblast journalists' organization board after they had discussed the recent resolution of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom [oblast party committee] and Gorkom [city party committee] Bureaus "On Changing the Structure of the Leningrad Press and Other Mass Media."

Honestly speaking, it was distressing for me, a LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent, to hear the applause of the deputies as they listened to information about some subscribers of "my" newspaper already appealing to the people's courts. These people consider as unjust the party decision which infringed upon the interests of thousands of Leningraders. These people had not subscribed only to the organ of the CPSU Obkom and Gorkom which our newspaper became after the one-sided decision, but also to the soviets' publication. By the way, nobody considered it necessary to seek our, the journalists', opinion on that either, unfortunately.

We think that the resolution of this unexpected conflict lies in the common discussion of it by the city and oblast soviet deputies commissions, members of the party obkom and gorkom, and representatives of the editors and publishers groups. They should consider the problems of the structure and accreditation of the mass media as well as of their material and technical resources so that

the decision will be in line with constitutional norms. That was the conclusion of the Leningrad City Soviet deputies.

The discussion of the report by Deputy A.N. Belyaev on the future structure and personnel of the Leningrad City Soviet, according to the agenda, was constructive and businesslike in spite of apprehensions that the subject would be drowned again in the emotions about "who owns the press."

During the debate many deputies spoke correctly about how much the soviet's rights and powers in our "great city of the oblast fate" depend on Leningrad's status. Will our city be entered in bureaucratic papers as a kray or oblast center or will it finally acquire the rights of a republic? Then our down-to-earth dreams about a Hamburg-like "free city" can become reality, if we, of course, make amends for our taxing life.

Some deputies, A.I. Rodin for instance, ask the following question: "If all the power from the party organs goes to the soviets soon, then the deputies will have a much heavier burden to carry than in the old days of the stagnation period. Then those selected by the people had to "work" only by obediently voting for the decisions made on top. Should we then make the Leningrad City Soviet permanent and pay salaries to the deputies?

What should the Leningrad City Soviet presidium be? Is it to become a simple coordinating organ or will it have various powers? The proposal to create a two-chamber presidium brought some excitement into the audience. It was suggested to have the chairmen of permanent committees in one chamber and elected representatives of various deputies' parties and factions in the other.

The deputies have already discussed the nominees for Leningrad City Soviet chairmen. The audience burst into applause when A.N. Belyayev announced that USSR Supreme Soviet member A.A. Sobchak agreed to run for a Leningrad City Soviet deputy at the runoff elections from Electoral District No. 53.

The deputies will probably need more than one day to "line up" the personnel of the Leningrad City Soviet presidium and the executive committee. But the main thing is that the constructive and creative work has started and the first organizational outline of the city soviet of people's deputies has become evident.

Deputies View New City Soviet

90UN1658C Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by A. Manilova: "Remnants of the Future"]

[Text] **The report heard Wednesday from Chairman of the Leningrad Socioeconomic Association A.B. Chubays concerning the new concept of economic reform, then the report from general director of the Signal Association V.P. Zanin, and, finally, yesterday's speech by Chairman of the Leningrad Planning Commission A.A. Bolshakov, demonstrated the level of competence and political maturity which the Leningrad soviet will not be able to "knock down," if you will. If, of course, it seriously intends not to accept anything on faith and carefully discuss everything.**

Let us look from this standpoint at the main thing, or in any case, the most remarkable thing taking place today behind the walls of the Great Hall of the Mariinskiy Palace, which our television viewers and readers are not seeing. First, there is the formation of factions, which began on the first day. Second, there is the creation of permanent committees and commissions of the Leningrad Soviet.

S.A. KUZNETSOV, department head of the Gipropribor Institute, Electoral District No. 162:

Yes, there has been a split among the democrats. Some—and they are in the majority—are inclined to use the old apparatus of the ispolkom [executive committee], directing its efforts into new political channels. Others are convinced that it is necessary to get rid of the old political machine which is under the complete political control of the party apparatus and is filled with ties, both horizontal and vertical. I am a proponent of this viewpoint.

[Manilova] What, we are not able to "destroy it to the foundation"....

[Kuznetsov] No, not "to the foundation." The technical personnel can remain, but they must be placed under the political control of the Leningrad soviet through personnel changes in the leadership of the ispolkom. This requires a clear expression of positions and, as a result, a clearcut formation of factions.

[Manilova] Is this not a remnant...of the future? After all, factions appear in places where if not parties then various political programs contradict one another.

[Kuznetsov] It seems to me that we have determined two directions within the democratic majority. And the center is formed from those in favor of deideologizing the parliament. But let us proceed from the forced situation in which the city has ended up, as V.Ya. Khodyrev has said in more figurative terms. We do not need unity at any price but the most radical measures to save the city.

K.V. SMIRNOV, director of the Astron Center for the scientific and technical creativity of youth and member of the council of the association of young leaders of enterprises and institutions of the USSR, Electoral District No. 46:

The striving to form factions quickly is alarming for the process of political differentiation and is far from complete. I think the only thing worth spending time and energy on today is that without which we cannot work. And the main thing, the priority task of the first session,

in my opinion, is for the people to see themselves as a kind of community, a "team" that is called upon to bring the city out of its chaos.

[Manilova] Do you know what the instrument is?

[Smirnov] Yes, it is the adoption of the USSR Law on Additional Authority of the Leningrad Soviet, and, to put it simply, a special status for the city. This means that any government or departmental decision that, in the opinion of the Leningrad Soviet, contradicts the interests of the city is invalidated.

Then, for instance, the Ministry of Finance would not dare refuse Leningrad 50 percent of the hard currency profit from Intourist, which it got away with doing quite recently. And what kind of justice or even logic is there in the fact that of the R9 billion in profit the city earns each year 7 billion are taken "off the top." True, 4 million, as the mayor told me, are returned in the form of ministry subsidies for the enterprises. Let us say that is true, but this does not make the situation any less absurd. For it turns out that the departments have twice as great a financial base for affecting city policy than the Leningrad soviet does.

A.N. MUSAKOV, director of Bioinf laboratory, Electoral District No. 366:

Division into factions according to political convictions is a reality. But it is also a reality that not all problems can be solved by political methods. As a counterbalance to the political factions there should be technological factions which would provide for the development of alternative decisions.

Access to information is a necessary condition for power and a guarantee of democracy. The creation of an open society and a mechanism for real control by it over the activity of state institutions will be nothing but a slogan unless we take steps toward this right away. I am speaking mainly about having the Leningrad Soviet create its own mass media.

[Manilova] The structure of the press as determined by the CPSU Obkom [oblast committee] does not suit you?

[Musakov] The very way the question is put does not suit me. The legal, administrative-economic, and other mechanisms for creating an organ of the Leningrad Soviet should be decided by it. On the basis of what publications will the newspaper be organized, what will it be called, and on what journalistic forces will it be based—all these complicated questions require in-depth, competent, and at the same time immediate study. I am convinced that this is a task for the special deputy commission which should be created.

[Manilova] How do you envisage the newspaper of the Leningrad soviet?

[Musakov] I see it as democratic in the true sense of the word, reflecting all the diversity of the positions of the deputy corps. This will also be a guarantee against replacing one monopoly on information with another.

Leningrad Deputies Discuss Tasks of Soviet

90UN1659A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 1

[Report on interviews with people's deputies A.Yu. Sungurov and L.E. Paydiyev, by A. Manilova: "To Forget the Illusions"]

[Text] **The constituents can clearly see the political backdrop for the events taking place in the Bolshoi Hall of the Mariinskiy Palace. But there are lots of hues and nuances there which can be sensed mostly from the conversations between sessions. So what do the deputies talk about here?**

A.Yu. Sungurov, senior researcher of the Central Science and Research Institute of Roentgen Rays and Radiology, Electoral District No. 39:

Outside the session we continue to form new parliamentary factions and to seek other approaches to the formation of permanent committees and commissions.

[Manilova] Other than what?

[Sungurov] Other than the departmental structure which was adopted by the organizational committee. Some deputies offer a different approach: They consider it unacceptable that a commission should include only the experts in one or another field (an education commission, for instance, would consist solely of teachers).

Furthermore, the commissions should set reforms as a goal for themselves. According to this concept, instead of commissions on industry or on transportation, we need commissions on demonopolizing the industry, on forming a market infrastructure, or on structural reconstruction of the regional economy.

[Manilova] During the first days the creation of a new faction was announced, a center-left faction "Democratic Russia." Is this a union of all liberal and democratic forces in the parliament?

[Sungurov] To be precise, it is a union of all democrats who envision a balanced, constructive, and parliamentary approach to any, most critical, most "explosive" problem. At a Sunday working meeting that was what we called our deputies' group: "Constructive Approach." Among the hundred deputies who have signed up for it there are supporters of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" and representatives of other sociopolitical movements who had formed a pre-election bloc "Democratic Elections—90."

[Manilova] You must be separated from the more radical part of the democratic majority by your choice of tactics, rather than strategy.

[Sungurov] That is correct. We have one criterion, which is business. For the sake of it, we think, we need to forget

about ambition and about certain vociferous declarations. We need to follow the agenda rigorously and try to make every meeting efficient to the maximum. The "forceful," rally-like methods of persuasion could be used in 1917, but they are out of place in 1990.

L.E. Paydiyev, senior researcher of the Institute of Finance and Economics, imeni Voznesenskiy; Electoral District No. 384:

The task of tasks for us is to receive from the center the resources and the rights that we need to conduct a truly radical economic reform in Leningrad. But let us face the truth: Moscow will give such powers only to a Leningrad soviet which presents an organized force. And our soviet is gaining strength in spite of the destructive role of some speeches or initiatives from the deputies.

[Manilova] Do you think that the appearance of parliamentary factions contributes to this?

[Paydiyev] I would answer with a categorical "no"—for now.

[Manilova] Why "for now"?

[Paydiyev] There will be a reason to break into factions only when the new economic policy of the center becomes reality. Here is the key question: Will the factories and plants be handed over to the workers or to the agencies which will then acquire the right to give them to the workers on profitable conditions? If this happens, it will inevitably give rise to a monopolistic (agency-rooted) bourgeoisie. The task of the Leningrad soviet is exactly this: We will not allow it whatever the position of the center might be.

Comments on Session

90UN1714A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by V. Koshvanets and A. Ozhegov: "The Spring Marathon"]

[Text] We have to pay due notice to the energy that the Leningrad City Soviet and some deputies apply when asserting their independence. It is even surprising at times: Nobody is trying to take their independence away and the only people the deputies have to answer to are their constituents.

However, we can understand the participants of the session. The majority of them conducted their preelection campaign under the banner of fighting the entire administrative and command machine; so now they are distrustful and overly sensitive as they reject anything that might seem to them an attempt to infringe on their deputy's rights and independence.

It is most evident, probably, at the "morning warm-ups" which is the name the journalists have given to the procedure of adopting the day's agenda. It has not yet happened that the agenda suggested by the secretariat was accepted unconditionally. Supplements and amendments, quite irrelevant at times, usually start pouring in as if from a horn of plenty. And any disagreement brings a vote of no confidence to the co-chairman conducting the meeting. One, by the way, can only wonder at the co-chairmen's self-control.

Yesterday again we had a chance to observe the full range of it all as well as the vote of "no confidence". Of course, the agenda offered at first had to be amended. As we watched all this we could not but wonder: Is independence in the name of independence all that necessary on one hand and, on the other, are the participants of the discussion really all that independent?

As we remember, some two weeks ago our newspaper wrote that the city and the oblast electoral commission decided to move the runoff elections from 22 April to 19 April. They also took into account the numerous voters' requests and set the time limits for the voting from 0600 to 2200. This information was repeatedly published in the press and announced over the radio. But yesterday morning, after the agenda of the meeting was amended, the session started discussing one deputy's suggestion about...extending the voting time until 2200 on 19 April. A belated comment from the audience about the time limit having already been set was the only thing that stopped voting on the issue. That is what the desire to be independent at any cost boils down to: They want to do it all by themselves. We do not even mention Ilf and Petrov who insisted through Ostap Bender that it is a crime not to read the newspapers.

We might be mistaken, but to us the following fact serves as another example of asserting independence for the sake of independence. In our previous report from the session we have already mentioned the proposed draft of a letter to the CPSU obkom [oblast party committee]. The letter suggested that the celebration of the 120th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birthday be financed entirely by the party organs. We also mentioned that the proposal caused a distinctly negative reaction among many of the deputies and that it was not approved. But yesterday, at the morning "warm-up" the participants of the session decided to go back to this proposal again. Even though the proposal failed to pass for the second time, this event left some rather unpleasant after taste. Really, is this the way and the place to assert one's independence?

The same question occurred to us when we read the proposed draft of an appeal from the Leningrad Soviet to the people of the city that was distributed among the deputies. The appeal dealt with the coming subbotnik and those who wrote it—members of the temporary deputies' commission for organizing the subbotnik and the May Day celebration—found many sincere words aimed at the hearts and souls of the Leningraders. Only one word was missing from this document—Lenin—which the people usually use when speaking of April subbotniks. Instead they proposed to call it "a spring subbotnik". In other words, first they had the "spring cake" which until recently had been a pet name

for the Easter cake, and now there is a spring subbotnik. However, we will restrain ourselves from further comments as they are going to vote on this appeal today.

Now we want to see how infallible the deputies' independence really is. We could not but notice, for instance, the actions of Deputy V.A. Panov, a co-chairman of the Green Party. Although he could use the electronic "for" and "against" push buttons, he voted by raising his hand, and his thumb at that was pointing sometimes up and sometimes down.

"What kind of conduct is this?" Deputy V.M. Sazonov expressed his indignation. "Are we voting by teams?"

Deputy Yu.K. Sevenard then supported his colleague as he saw the gestures of his own neighbor in the Bolshoy Hall of the Mariinskiy Palace, V.V. Skoybeda, who represents the Democratic Union.

Yes, the expected has happened: The elected representatives of the people formed deputies' factions—the Democratic Bloc and the "independents" group, in particular, as well as the association "For the Revival of Leningrad." And as the situation at the meeting is "a variable component" the leaders have to resort to these childish ways of signaling to their supporters how and for whom they should vote. Maybe, the gorispolkom [city executive committee] that is still acting should provide electronic equipment for voting by factions?

This proposal, of course, is nothing but a joke, but the deputies themselves also create comic situations as the discussions become heated. When they were discussing the draft regulations on the future chairman they mentioned among others his duty "to unveil the monuments to the outstanding people of the state, culture, and science". Somebody in the audience added at once "and to cover them up if the Leningraders request it." The audience responded with laughter. This amendment has not been adopted yet.

The temporary regulations on the highest official in Leningrad were adopted by the session after they excluded the provisions on deputy chairmen. They could not agree on the nomination procedure: whether the deputy chairmen should be selected by the chairman and then approved by the session or elected directly by the session. As for the chairman it was decided to elect him at a Leningrad Soviet session and not by the city referendum.

After the speech of Deputy A.A. Kovalev the deputies conducted a preliminary discussion on the issue of handing buildings and structures over to organizations and enterprises. As B.A. Kurkova took the floor during the debate she quoted letters of Leningraders in which they describe how the cooperatives and industrial organizations unexpectedly become the tenants of ancient mansions. This important conversation will be continued today. They intend to form a special deputies' commission.

In other words, the spring marathon continues in the Mariinskiy Palace and, apart from joy, it brings the city some concerns which are not spring-like at all.

Medvedev Meets With Leningrad Workers 17 Apr

90UN1745A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 90 p 3

[I. Losev report on comments by V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, at a meeting with workers of the "Elektrosila" Association on 17 April 1990: "V.A. Medvedev: 'There Is Just One Way—Rectifying Mistakes, Moving Forward...'"]

[Text] **As already reported, V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the party Central Committee, paid a visit to Leningrad. Vadim Andreyevich stopped, in particular, at "Elektrosila," the Hermitage and Leningrad State University and met with the city's artistic intelligentsia.**

Today we publish our correspondent's account of V.A. Medvedev's meeting with the working people of the "Elektrosila" Association, which took place on 17 April 1990.

The conversation began in the shops and on the shop floor and then continued in the association's conference hall, where representatives of the enterprise's party activists—secretaries and members of the shop party bureaus and the party committee and subdivision leaders—had assembled.

The "Elektrosila" people wanted to hear a Politburo member evaluate international and intra-union events, the pre-congress debate and the course of the economic reform.... Such lively interest in the discussion may be explained by the words of a participant in the meeting: "I have been in the party for 15 years, but it is the first time that I have had an opportunity to talk with a secretary of the Central Committee, and I request an answer to my question...."

Speaking about the purpose of his visit, V.A. Medvedev emphasized that he wanted to meet with the work force of Leningrad's enterprises, the Communists and party activists of enterprises and establishments and leaders of the Leningrad party organization, listen to their opinions and get a feel for the people's mood and also participate in the preparation of the upcoming joint 29th oblast and 27th city conference of the Leningrad CPSU organization.

"I have brought no special plans and decisions with me," Vadim Andreyevich said. "And they are not possible, I believe, on the eve of the Leningrad party conference."

Describing the complex situation in the country, Comrade Medvedev said that measures are being implemented for the solution of the most acute interethnic

conflicts and glaring socioeconomic problems, primarily those connected with the normalization of the consumer market.

Switching to questions of the pre-congress debate in the CPSU, Vadim Andreyevich said that, together with positive results, the intra-party argument had also engendered a number of essential problems: Some people would like to divert the debate from the path of discussion of urgent problems and use it to attain ends which have nothing in common with the interests of the party.

The Central Committee and the Politburo are opposed to division. We support the discussion of all questions without any restrictions and a search for ways to solve them. We are for party unity, but not at any price.

Clearly, given the entire seriousness of the situation, we need to find constructive solutions which would enable the party to maintain its positions of leading progressive force and contribute to the successful functioning of our political mechanism and the soviets under the new conditions, which are strange for many people.

We publish below V.A. Medvedev's answers to the most topical questions put to him by the participants in the meeting.

[Question] Do the Politburo and the Presidential Council clearly understand that progress toward economic recovery could lead to a decline in the working people's living standard? Is it possible to switch to a market economy without a decline in the people's living standard?

[Medvedev] Discussion of this difficult question is under way in the government. Truly, it is difficult to effect economic recovery, to reach a position where the shelves do not stand empty and at the same time to ensure that the interests of broad strata of the population do not suffer. Particularly those on a fixed income: pensioners, students, invalids....

I believe that it will be very difficult to avoid a decline in real income among some categories of the population during the transition to a market economy. But if prices begin to rise, indexation, that is, a corresponding adjustment of earnings, will necessarily be introduced.

[Question] Whereas policy tolerates various currents and divisions, the economy does not. In the economy there must be order: The currents in policy are various, but discipline in the economy, just one. I would like to know: When are they planning to introduce the market economy? What will happen to prices? After all, when people speak of the market now they are thinking more of the stores, but the market also means the production sphere. And destroying the industrial-economic ties which took shape in the years of the functioning of the command-administrative system is easy. But what in exchange? Will this not lead to the collapse of our already ailing economy?

[Medvedev] We do not plan to delay the introduction of market relations, and real steps in this direction will have been taken by next year. On the other hand, it should not be thought that there has hitherto been nothing of the market in our economy and that now everything will be stood on its head. In my view all the best achievements of the former methods of management must necessarily be preserved, including cooperative supply relations. It is a bad thing when these ties are based merely on the discipline of the schedule of allocations and conflict with economic laws. We need to be rid of this contradiction and bring order to bear in pricing.

The economy cannot be allowed to collapse, but at the same time world practice shows that we will score no serious successes in the economy without the use of market relations. Of course, the measures proposed by the government will be submitted for extensive public discussion.

[Question] Several party platforms have now been published: that of the CPSU Central Committee, the "Democratic Platform," the "Marxist Platform".... Please comment on them, if possible. Is not the statement that there should not be factions within the party grounds for demarcation? It would seem that the authors of these platforms are not extremists in the party but wish to return to the theoretical propositions of Marx and develop on that basis. What is your opinion on this score?

[Medvedev] I support the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee, which was discussed at the Central Committee plenum and which has now been submitted for nationwide discussion. I believe that the policy line of the CPSU Central Committee is expressed in the draft sufficiently fully, although it is not without shortcomings and work left undone and it is open to improvement and additional work. The draft was published so that the Communists' additions and observations could be taken into consideration in the course of the debate and the final version of the CPSU Platform adopted at the congress.

I believe it necessary to eliminate the fragmentary nature and incomprehensibility of some of the draft's propositions. Criticism of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for its lack of a section on the party's ideological work is justified, in my view. Although the platform has ideological content from the first line, essentially. I consider the criticism of the draft for the absence of any mention of our ultimate development goal—the communist perspective—to be fair. But if you noticed, the preamble to the draft new CPSU Rules contains such a mention. It would be appropriate, in my opinion, in the draft main political document also because we have no grounds for abandoning the communist idea, although the immediate goal of the CPSU Platform is transition to humane democratic socialism. Transition from what, you ask. From the previous deformed, distorted socialism, from a socialism which may be termed state,

centralist, and administrative with nothing in common with the vital creativity of the masses.

As far as the so-called "Democratic Platform" is concerned (I say "so-called" because its authors evidently wish by its very name to emphasize that the other platforms are not democratic, and I disagree with this from the outset: the CPSU Central Committee Platform also is a democratic platform), this is an original document which mainly expounds questions of intra-party life. It cannot, I believe, lay claim to the role of the party's program document because it does not contain sections on socioeconomic, political, interethnic, and foreign policy problems. In other words, it contains no proposals in respect of the party's political course.

Questions of the party's role, the party structure and the party's work methods are truly, on the other hand, expounded there in sufficient detail. But it is on these that disagreements are revealed. Supporters of the "Democratic Platform" say that the CPSU Central Committee Platform supports the vanguard role of the party, but that they support a parliamentary party. This needs investigating, by the Communists primarily. It is simply an illogical counterbalancing. After all, any party is the vanguard part of some social force and expresses its interests.

However, in saying that we regard the CPSU as a vanguard party, we wish to say that it will express the interests of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia and the fundamental interests of the whole people, formulate its domestic and foreign policy on the basis of its theoretical ideas and with regard for the interests of the people, and exercise political leadership of the country if we remain the ruling party.

The "Democratic Platform" supporters say: "The party should be parliamentary...." But we do not deny the parliamentary function. Indeed, each party is an instrument of the struggle for political power and conducts a parliamentary struggle, a struggle for its representation in the organs of power. We are opposed only to this exhausting the role of the party.

We believe that our party should be a permanent factor of political life. And not only in the soviets but in other public organizations, the work force, and so forth also. Such is our understanding of the role of a political party in a civil society.

There are differences in the platforms on the principle of democratic centralism. In the Democratic Platform this principle is, seemingly, denied. But I have to say plainly that this denial is inconsistent. In particular, the Democratic Platform records that the minority should subordinate itself to the decisions of the majority. But it is this which is the essence of democratic centralism. That the minority may have its own opinion, express it and have the right to uphold its opinion even after a decision has been adopted is another matter. But complying with the decision is obligatory. This is party discipline.

We support a fundamental renewal of democratic centralism and advocate the center of gravity shifting to democratism. We are against bureaucratic centralism.

And one further difference. True, the Democratic Platform speaks very indistinctly and incomprehensibly about this: The idea that the party should quit the labor collectives is expressed obliquely. In other words, the Democratic Platform is opposed to the production-territorial principle of the party's composition. I categorically disagree with this because quitting the labor collectives, leaving merely horizontal structures, like special-interest clubs, would mean making the CPSU some amorphous organization and depriving it of its main sphere of activity. I am convinced that perdition awaits the party on this path.

And the most important issue—concerning factions. The supporters of the Democratic Platform demand freedom for factions in the party. But the appeal for freedom for factions conceals their aspiration to split the party, split it from within and create a new party.

What is understood by factions? If it is freedom of expression of opinions and difference of opinions, there would be no question here. But what is understood by factions is something else—freedom to create within the party exclusive groupings with central and local authorities, a system of rules and their own press organs, which is, in fact, what the "Democratic Platform" supporters are now doing. It is with this that we categorically disagree: The party cannot be turned into a sum total of exclusive political groupings living their own life. What's the point of such a party, one wonders.

We propose to the leaders of the Democratic Platform: If you wish to leave the party, go, form your own organizations. We will then conduct a polemic with you, as with another party, enter into negotiations and conclude agreements on some issues.

This is my attitude toward the "Democratic Platform". As far, however, as the "Marxist Platform" published in PRAVDA is concerned, I believe that it has much that is similar to the CPSU Central Committee Platform. But I would say that this document bears the imprimatur of the traditional, old approach. There is much in the Marxist Platform which deserves attention and discussion, I believe, and PRAVDA was absolutely right to publish the platform, in my opinion.

I would like to say that these three platforms by no means exhaust the spectrum of opinions within the party. There are other documents, other positions, and others will appear. The Academy of Sciences has its draft party political document expressing the scientific intelligentsia's perception of our problems. A so-called action congress for the creation of a Russian Communist Party will be held in Leningrad. Its organizers have their platform, whose defects are, in my opinion, dogmatism and pre-perestroyka approaches.

We intended from the very outset that the pre-congress debate would develop with regard for the diversity of opinions and positions, and, as the "October Letter of the CPSU Central Committee" emphasizes, the publication of some platform does not signify the appearance of a faction. No, this is the normal process of discussion. As far as the organizational measures about which the "Letter" speaks are concerned, they are aimed by no means against platforms or those who support one platform or another and who are participating in the debate on this basis. These possible measures should be directed against those who are struggling for a split in the party and who are engaging in factional activity and thereby placing themselves outside of the party ranks.

It would be more honorable for such CPSU members to quit its ranks themselves. But in cases where, out of some tactical considerations, they themselves do not leave, the party organizations should help them determine their position and decide to which party to belong.

[Question] You have spoken about the "Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee" published in the press.... Such documents are no longer accepted automatically these days. The Communists want to know who is behind this "Letter." After all, there was in this connection neither a Central Committee plenum nor some meeting, which in the course of discussion, in keeping with the current understanding of the level of democracy in the party, produced the result of such-and-such members of the Politburo and Central Committee voting for the "Letter".... Today, however, against the background of the difficult situation in the primary party organizations, such published documents as the "Letter" evoke in Communists rather the reverse response. And it was late in appearing also. Why?

[Medvedev] I will not try to prove that one decision or another was adopted by the leadership of the party or the state precisely when it should have been. But I would like to mention that we are frequently criticized for being late in decision-making, but when urgent measures are needed and they are adopted, we are criticized for haste.

Now about the "Letter".... The Politburo decided to send out the draft "Letter" together with the corresponding decision to all candidates and members of the CPSU Central Committee, members of the Auditing Commission and the first secretaries of oblast party committees and the union republic communist party central committees in order that they might express their opinions on it.

We received comments and observations from practically all of them and studied them most carefully. An absolute majority supported the idea of publication of the "Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee." I have to say that, compared with the initial version, the published text is set forth in a more constructive spirit in order not to give certain groupings—of the extreme left or right—a "stick" with which they could beat honest Communists. In this we succeeded, in my opinion, and we gave them no "stick".

Selection of Rayon Envoys to CPSU Congress

WA0805191090 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by M. Grodnitskaya: "Congress Elections: Rayon Variant"]

[Text] **In the conversation with A. Prokofyev, head of the division of organizational-party and personnel work of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee], published in the 3 April 1990 issue, the topic was the possible mechanisms for conducting direct, secret, competitive elections of delegates to the 28th party congress. Today we are beginning to discuss the decisions being made on the eve of the election campaign in the rayons.**

Two questions—the most crucial for communists today—were placed on the agenda of the conference of the Kuybyshevskiy Rayon party organization: the procedure for selecting delegates to the 28th party congress and the time periods for conducting the report and election campaign.

Communists agreed a month ago when they gathered for the first meeting of the conference and were developing their own platform for the 28th party congress (it was published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA) that the selection of delegates to the congress, as to the city conference, should be direct, competitive, and secret.

The working commission of the conference (it included 40 representatives from practically all the large party organizations of the rayon) generalized the suggestions that had been made and the materials from a questionnaire which included half of the rayon party organization, and then reported its conclusions to the conference. The majority of delegates are inclined to have the delegates selected from several single-mandate districts.

One can say with certainty that each participant in the conference had a clear understanding of the advantages of each principle for forming the districts. Probably each of those gathered there understood that elections in the single-mandate district are the most democratic variant. This way all the communists vote for the candidates. This was also confirmed by the working commission. But with this approach it might turn out that a large number of candidates end up on the ballot and the voters have neither the time nor the opportunity to learn about each of them. They have to vote blindly. And there is indeed very little time. It is necessary not only to select the delegates but also to give them some time, even a small amount, to think about and discuss the basic documents with their constituents.

Having weighed all the pros and cons, the communists of the rayon organization voted to create eight single-mandate districts.

And again there was heated discussion. How should they be formed, according to what principle? It is possible to encounter so many underwater reefs on the way that the ship of the elections could be threatened with running aground. Here are just a few that were considered by those who had gathered. Say that a district is created from two party organizations with the rights of raykoms [rayon committees]. Well, is the result predetermined? Will the candidate who represents the largest number in the party organization win? They will most likely vote for their own candidate. To be honest, it seemed to me that the participants in the conference did not "get around" this danger.

Or something else: The representative of the territorial party organization who spoke at the conference suggested joining all territorial organizations together into one district. But the conference thought that this would increase the risk of an actual failure to complete the selection. Half of the members of the territorial party organization are elderly and seriously ill people and there is the danger that they will not be able to participate in the elections. It is known that it is sometimes difficult to conduct a meeting in such an organization.

Mainly in the formation of districts they adhered to the branch principle—although not in pure form, as it were. One district is the party organization of heavy industry enterprises, another—science, a third—transportation, and so forth. Why is it precisely like this and not any other way?

"Very little time was allotted anyway. And, after all, the communists should really be able to recognize the future delegates and evaluate their merits. Related collectives in a rayon, as a rule, know one another better. They have more frequent contact. This means that it is easier for them to make a choice," this was the answer Ye. Panteleyev, first secretary of the Kuybyshevskiy CPSU Raykom, gave to the question.

When observing the work of the conference you automatically compare present and the past styles. Of course the present is better. For several hours in a row the people made notes on their documents (although someone correctly noted that the proposals for forming the districts could have been distributed at least a day ahead). S. Karpov (Khromatron Plant), for example, noted that he thinks it is wrong that any communist can be nominated. Is this not a loophole for inserting necessary candidates who cannot make it in the party organization or district where they are known?

As concerns the second question on the agenda, in general it caused a lot of disagreement. Participants in the conference blamed it on the fact that the report and election rayon conference should be conducted after the congress and the question of the time periods for reports and elections in the local organizations should be left completely to the discretion of the latter.

New Moscow Soviet Session Continues

WA1505183590 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 1

[Article by N. Batalova and V. Nechayev: "Our Special Correspondents Speak About the Third Day of the Session"]

[Text] The third day of the session began with a report by E. Bakirov, chairman of the organizational committee. The deputy presented information about the committee meeting, at which the results of the first two days were analyzed. Of the 11 scheduled issues for the first part of the session only two had been resolved by the beginning of the third day, and they were the least laborious. According to the opinion of the organizational committee, emphasized E. Bakirov, such a work pace and the course of the meetings of the session itself cannot satisfy either the deputies or the residents of Moscow. What reasons did the organizational committee find for such a holdup?

In the first place, organization of the meetings by the working presidium was unsatisfactory. A lack of experience made itself felt at times both in slipshod observation of the procedures of discussion and in numerous repetitions when, in the course of the meeting, questions going beyond the bounds of the agenda arose spontaneously. In the second place, the organizational committee itself is evaluating its own role quite critically, and in this case there must be an opportunity to correct the matter.

And E. Bakirov made an appeal to the deputies on this matter. He proposed that the procedure for discussion of issues be adhered to more strictly in order to increase the efficiency of the session's work.

However the further progress of the meeting showed that by far not all the deputies took in the appeal. Again and again group ambitions were in evidence which went at times beyond the bounds of parliamentary etiquette. Just as in the first two days, the desire of some of the deputies to gain the attention of the audience at any cost slowed down forward movement and affected the productivity of the session's work.

Almost the whole day the deputies discussed the session's rules, constantly departing from the main task and continually violating the work procedure that they themselves had established. As happened the day before, lines formed at the microphone. And the discussion of the session's rules occasionally turned into a discussion of the rules of the Moscow Soviet itself. In the meantime, it is not worth exaggerating the significance of the rules for the first session. We know that the document is provisional and is only valid until the rules for the Moscow City Soviet are adopted. However in the course of discussing the draft presented by the organizational committee, passions became so heated that more than once the chairman had to call for order or else go to the extreme of switching off the microphone.

Incidentally, renting the premises of the Sociopolitical Center for only four days will cost the Moscow Soviet and the residents of Moscow R30,705. But judging by the pace at which discussion of the 11 questions on the agenda is moving, it is still a long time until a break in the plenary meetings.

Discussion of Article 34 turned out to be especially emotional. According to Deputy B. Yelagin, who spoke on behalf of the group of independent deputies, issues on the agenda should be decided by a two-thirds majority and not by a simple majority as the draft stipulated. The deputy based his proposal on the fact that such a practice would introduce the principle of defending the rights of the minority into the practice of the Moscow Soviet. According to a declaration of the independent deputies, the proposed amendment to Article 34 would permit accord to be reached on a majority of the most important issues.

Unfortunately the amendment proposed by the independent deputies did not have the support of the majority, represented by deputies of the "Democratic Russia" bloc. Many of the speakers expressed the fear that a two-thirds vote would paralyze the decisionmaking process, and in this fashion no concession was made to the minority on this occasion. A new stage of confrontation led a significant group of independent deputies to leave the auditorium without waiting for an intermission.

One cannot help noting that such a form of protest is becoming the tradition.

Speaking candidly, it is extremely difficult to follow the course of the debates. It seemed to us that serious work, and this was the goal of the session, sometimes gave way to contests of eloquence. Was this not the reason the number of journalists in the press box diminished noticeably? MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS followed our newspaper and VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in the number of the "offenders." In the meantime journalists, illuminating the life of the city and knowing its sore spots, were interested in effective work by the deputies.

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the deputies' work is also the goal of a sociological questionnaire distributed yesterday before the beginning of the meeting. It was developed by the multipurpose scientific advice center "Sodeystviye." In particular there is a question asking when Muscovites will feel the first results of the activities of the Moscow Soviet. The range of possible answers is from six months to five years. There is also one more answer on the questionnaire: "I find it difficult to reply." In the meantime one waits for a definite answer, and not only on the questionnaire, from the new soviet of the Muscovites.

Only at the very end of the third day of meetings was the scheduled account of the credentials commission finally reached. R. Novikov, chairman of the commission, acquainted the deputies with interesting statistical data characterizing the makeup of the new soviet. There are 426 men and only 39 women among the elected deputies. There are 436 deputies with higher education, and 106 have a scholarly degree or title. It is necessary to note that in terms of age, the Moscow Soviet consists for the most part of people of medium age—from 30 to 49 years old. Youths only make up 8 percent of it. In terms of career, representatives of science, making up 32 percent of the deputies, undoubtedly take the lead.

For the present the credentials committee has only finished the first part of its work, having verified the authority of 444 of the 465 deputies elected on 4 and 18 March.

Today the deputies will begin discussing the report of the credentials committee.

Appeal of Moscow Party Secretaries Group Published

90UN1684D Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 2

[Appeal by Moscow conference of secretaries of local party organizations: "For the Unity of All Supporters of Radical Renewal of the CPSU"]

[Text] **This initiative group is well known to the capital's communists. At present it comprises the secretaries of about 100 of the city's party organizations. Functioning since October 1989, the conference has developed a number of valuable proposals for democratizing and renewing the party. The most important of them have been published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. Today we are printing an appeal by the Moscow conference of secretaries of local party organizations to communists.**

Comrades!

The political position of our conference is known. It was published in the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA GAZETA on 30 March. Its main goal is to unite supporters of radical renewal of the CPSU.

Working in the local organizations and labor collectives, we are extremely aware of the critical nature of the situation our party is experiencing. In our opinion, only radical renewal of the party can guarantee the CPSU a future.

It would seem that everyone supports this basic idea. But as the elections to the 28th Congress approach, forces trying to split the supporters of CPSU renewal are becoming increasingly active.

The conservative and patriotic wing, using the United Workers Front (OFT) group, has gone to great efforts to create its "own" party inside the CPSU under the pretext of reconstituting a Russian Communist Party. They are in a hurry to sidestep and outrun the conference where the delegates of the 28th Congress from all Russia's party organizations must gather.

On the other hand, the coordinating committee of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" movement adopted a 19 March resolution calling upon communists—supporters of "Democratic Platform"—"to begin the process of forming a new political party." This is a call to split the CPSU, but now from the "radical" position.

Objectively, independent of the intentions of its authors, the resolution only answers the interests of the conservative forces.

Who has an interest in the absence at the congress of the most radical portion of the supporters of CPSU renewal? Who will profit by setting the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" against the draft Platform of the CPSU Central Committee? The answer is apparent. And it has not been slow in coming.

Initially the Bureau of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee adopted a special letter of instructions demanding that "organizational measures" be taken against open supporters of the "Democratic Platform." And finally there appeared a CPSU Central Committee open letter "For Consolidation on the Basis of Principle." This document requires that the leaders of "Democratic Platform" be separated out, which in practice could lead to mass expulsion and resignation from the CPSU of many active communists who do not think in the ordinary fashion. The letter proposes that "organizers of factions" be expelled and that those "who have been carried along" be "convinced of the rightness of party policy." But the whole issue is that "party policy" is being worked out today in the course of discussions and the comparison of platforms and positions, and it will be defined only at the 28th CPSU Congress.

If we are already speaking about separating out people in the interests of increasing the party's role in society, then in our opinion the line should be drawn between the supporters of radical renewal of the CPSU and the party's conservative wing, which is pulling us backward. This is why we categorically reject any attempts, including those contained in the CPSU Central Committee open letter, to divide the ranks of the supporters of decisive renewal of our party. Among the supporters of "Democratic Platform" there are many of our comrades whose deeds prove their desire to increase the role of the party.

And no statements by individual leaders of this movement, no "organizational measures" of the conservative portion of the CPSU leadership must hinder the resolution of the most immediate and important goal—to elect the most active supporters of radical renewal of the party at the 28th Congress.

We are convinced that during the period of preparations for the congress there must not be any sort of disciplinary measures or pressure limiting freedom of discussion in the party. The congress will make its decisions based on its makeup. Too much depends on these decisions for us to permit ourselves to give way before the conservative forces.

We call upon all communists to defend the unity of the democratic forces and all supporters of the party's renewal.

Adopted at the conference of secretaries of party organizations, 13 April 1990.
[Signed] S. Bortnovskiy and A. Mironyuk, cochairmen, and 34 other signatures.

Commission Meets on Repeat Election of Deputies

WA1505184790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS Article: "Voting Again"]

[Text] A regular meeting of the Central Electoral Commission on elections of RSFSR people's deputies was held on 28 April.

Information was presented by V.I. Kazakov, chairman of the commission, on the results of repeat elections for RSFSR people's deputies in individual electoral districts and the registration of elected RSFSR people's deputies. It was noted that repeat elections were held on 19 and 22 April in 35 electoral districts. Reports on their results are being published in the press.

The meeting examined the question of conducting repeat elections for RSFSR people's deputies in the Kashirskiy No. 71, Noginskiy City No. 81, Severnyy No. 12, and Pushkinskiy No. 91 electoral districts. On the basis of Article 53 of the RSFSR Law "On Elections to RSFSR People's Deputies," the commission scheduled repeat elections in the indicated districts for 14 June 1990.

The periods for conducting pre-election measures were confirmed. The nomination of candidates for RSFSR people's deputies must be conducted in the period from 6 to 12 May, and the registration of nominated candidates from 12 to 14 May. The report of the district electoral commission concerning the composition of registered candidates for RSFSR people's deputies is to be published in the press from 13 to 18 May, and the meetings of candidates with voters are being organized to start from the day of registration of candidates for deputy and continue until 13 June.

The commission also considered some other questions.

Repeat Election Results

90UN1724B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Central Electoral Commission report: "On the Results of Repeat Elections of RSFSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] Having examined the protocols submitted by district electoral commissions on the results of the repeat elections of RSFSR people's deputies, the Central Electoral Commission reports:

In accordance with Article 53 of the RSFSR Law "On the Election of RSFSR People's Deputies," repeat elections were held on 19 and 22 April 1990 in 30 territorial and five national-territorial electoral districts.

In the territorial electoral districts, 69.7 percent of the voters on the rolls took part in the voting, and in the national- territorial electoral districts, 64.6 percent of the voters on the rolls took part in the voting. Declared invalid were 172,852 voter ballots, which constitutes 3.5 percent of the number of ballots dropped in the ballot boxes.

As a result of the repeat elections, RSFSR people's deputies were elected in six territorial and two national-territorial electoral districts. In 24 electoral districts, in each of which more than two candidates were on the ballot and not one of whom was elected, in accordance with Article 52 of the RSFSR Law "On the Election of RSFSR People's Deputies" a runoff election will be conducted.

In Kashirskiy No 71 (Moscow Oblast) Electoral District, neither of the two candidates on the ballot collected the necessary number of votes from the voters. In connection with the failure of voters to turn out, the repeat elections in Noginskiy City No 81 (Moscow Oblast) Territorial Electoral District and Severnyy No 12 (City of Leningrad) National-Territorial Electoral District were declared inconclusive.

In all of these districts, repeat elections will be held in accordance with Article 53 of the Law on Elections.

Information on the results of repeat elections in each territorial and national-territorial electoral district are published by the district electoral commissions in the local press.

The Central Electoral Commission, on the basis of Article 49 of the RSFSR Law "On the Election of RSFSR People's Deputies," registered the following RSFSR people's deputies who were elected on 22 April 1990:

Anishchev, Vladimir Petrovich, chairman of the RSFSR People's Control Committee, who lives in the city of Moscow, elected from the Liskinskiy No 34 National-Territorial District of Voronezh Oblast;

Belin, Konstantin Maksimovich, chief of the main directorate of internal affairs of the Executive Committee of the Moscow Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, who lives in the city of Moscow, elected from the Shaturskiy No 101 Territorial District of Moscow Oblast;

Bochkarev, Vasiliy Kuzmich, chairman of the executive committee of the Railroad Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies of the City of Penza, who lives in the City of Penza, elected from the Railroad No 566 Territorial District of Penza Oblast;

Bulygin, Viktor Vasilyevich, first deputy chairman of the Executive Committee of the Belgorod Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, chairman of the agroindustrial union, who lives in the City of Belgorod, elected from the Rakityanskiy No 288 Territorial District of Belgorod Oblast;

Gerasimov, Valentin Pavlovich, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kurgan Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, who lives in the City of Kurgan, elected from the Shumikhinskiy No 485 Territorial District of Kurgan Oblast;

Golubkin, Vasiliy Petrovich, director of the Nelidovo plant "Torfmash," who lives in the City of Nelidovo, elected from the Nelidovskiy No 414 Territorial District of Kalinin Oblast;

Polozkov, Ivan Kuzmich, first secretary of the Krasnodar Kray Committee of the CPSU, who lives in the City of Krasnodar, elected from the Leningradskiy No 179 Territorial District of Krasnodar Kray;

Travov, Vasiliy Pavlovich, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Stavropolskiy Kray Soviet of People's Deputies, who lives in the City of Stavropol, elected from the Stavropolskiy No 22 National- Territorial District of Stavropolskiy Kray.
[Signed] Central Electoral Commission for the Election of People's Deputies of the RSFSR.

Election Official Discusses Delegate Selection

90UN1731A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Apr 90 p 2

[Interview with V. Nosov, secretary of the party committee of the Motor Vehicle Plant imeni I.A. Likhachev, chairman of the Moscow City Electoral Commission for Election of Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Forthcoming City Party Conference: "A Struggle for the Credentials of Trust"; date and place of interview, identity of interviewer not specified; first paragraph is MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Questions concerning the election campaign in the party are often discussed today during the course of party meetings. This is the subject of our discussion with V. Nosov, secretary of the party committee of the Motor Vehicle Plant imeni I.A. Likhachev and chairman of the Moscow City Electoral Commission for Election of Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Forthcoming City Party Conference.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] Vladimir Borisovich, what is the composition of the City Electoral Commission?

[Nosov] The City Electoral Commission is comprised of 35 individuals. There is a representative from each rayon

party organization, each of whom was elected either in the Bureau or at a plenum of the CPSU Raykom [rayon party committee]. In other words it is a "quality" composition, highly diverse if we look at it purely from the point of view of the occupational aspect. The membership of the City Electoral Commission includes party committee and bureau secretaries, leaders in the economy, workers, and scientific employees. In short, it is a most representative composition.

Each of these members coordinates the effort on the conduct of elections in his own rayon. Premises are presently allocated for the work of the commission in the party gorkom [city committee] building at 6 Staraya Ploshchad, where commission members are on duty from 0900 to 1800 hours. If uncertainty or questions arise in someone's mind with respect to the election of delegates to the congress, he can phone a commission representative during those hours and obtain an exhaustive response. The telephone numbers are 222-92-75, 206-65-02, and 222-97-82.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] Besides the City Commission, what other commissions for conducting elections in the city have been established, and what constitutes the work of the City Electoral Commission?

[Nosov] Rayon electoral commissions have been established on the rayon level, which independently decide all organizational matters, monitor the process of conducting the elections in party districts, and answer completely for the preelection campaign and generalization of voting results. Additionally, district and precinct commissions are already operating in all districts.

The City Electoral Commission primarily renders methodological assistance to rayon electoral commissions and resolves matters of contention arising during the elections. We try to structure the work of the commission in such a way as to effect maximum analysis of the situation in the rayons and orient the rayon electoral commissions towards optimal operation, but without directly interfering in their activity.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] What kinds of questions are brought up at sessions of the City Commission?

[Nosov] As of today, three sessions of the City Electoral Commission have already taken place, during which matters were examined regarding the nomination of candidates for delegate both in the rayons and in party districts. Reports were heard from representatives of Baumanskiy, Gagarinskiy, Kirovskiy, Kuybyshevskiy, Lyublinskiy, Sokolnicheskiy, Tushinskiy, and Frunzenskiy Rayon Electoral Commissions regarding basic approaches to conducting elections. Constant analysis is conducted of the process of nominating candidates for delegate to the congress and conference. Also discussed were questions related to the conduct of voting in party districts.

Matters examined at the most recent commission session on 19 April included the procedure for electing delegates to the city party conference in Soviet Army military units stationed in Moscow, procedure for registering candidates for delegate to the congress and the city conference, and other issues.

In all, 281 individuals should be elected from Moscow for the forthcoming congress. As of today more than 1,500 candidates have already been nominated in the rayon party organizations for this number of seats.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] What can you say about the social composition of candidates for delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Nosov] Practically all social segments of Moscow are represented in the broadest candidate spectrum. Those nominated include many party workers, employees in science and the economy. At the same time there are as yet very few—fewer than 100—candidates for delegate to the congress from the worker milieu. This is a very small number when we look at the grand scheme of things, and is particularly troubling to the City Commission because candidate nomination has already been completed in most of the rayons. Not a single worker-communist has been nominated to the Congress in Volgogradskiy Rayon, for example, and in such major industrial rayons as Kuybyshevskiy and Pervomayskiy—only one.

This is a question of principle, in my view, and it was a subject of discussion at the latest session. Our view was unequivocal: The composition of Congress delegates from the Moscow city party organization absolutely must include representatives of the working class.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] Heated debate is often evoked by the question—may an individual be nominated as a candidate for Congress delegate if he is a Communist not on the rolls of the given party organization? And how many candidates in general may be nominated?

[Nosov] Most rayons have decided that candidates may be nominated as delegates to the congress and conference only if they are members of that rayon's party organization. At the same time, rayons such as Krasnogvardeyskiy, Khoroshevskiy, and a number of others have afforded Communists unrestricted rights in this regard. But such matters are touched upon in the normative documents on the conduct of elections of delegates and have been ratified by CPSU raykom plenums.

We see a great number of individuals contending for one seat—from five to ten, on the average. In Sokolnicheskiy Rayon, for example, 77 candidates are vying for 10 seats as congress delegate and 75 candidacies are contending for 40 seats at the city party conference.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] A great many problems arise during the course of preparations for the voting. How should the voting process itself be organized? What particular features do we see in determining the election results?

[Nosov] We should note that many of the organizers of today's elections were quite recently engaged in conducting the voting in elections to the soviets of people's deputies. Thus, I do not believe the organization of secret balloting and tallying the ballots for precinct electoral commissions will present anything new. The only difference will be that voting ballots are issued based on the listing of Communists in a given district, upon presentation of party card.

It is apparent that the first round of voting may not yield conclusive results and runoff elections will be required. In such event, in the electoral district in which our plant is located, for example, ballots will include the names of candidates who have amassed the greatest number of votes—and their number will be one more than the number of vacant seats. It is important that the element of competition be preserved even at this stage of the elections.

[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA] When will the election campaign be concluded?

[Nosov] The Plenum of the Moscow City CPSU Committee has recommended that the election of delegates basically be concluded in the districts prior to 10 May.

The city electoral commission also believes that the elections should be concluded at approximately the same time in all rayons. This is primarily due to the necessity for the delegates' active participation in preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and city party conference. Such a desire has been and continues to be expressed by many primary party organizations and Communists. In Baumanskiy and Frunzenskiy Rayons, unfortunately, only the first round of elections is scheduled for completion 10-15 May. Naturally, the final results may be dragged out.

It is appropriate to state here that the first delegates have already been elected. V.N. Senkov, first secretary of the Leninskiy CPSU Raykom, has been elected delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress, as have USSR People's Deputies A.M. Yemelyanov, Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, and Yu.M. Zabrodin. Elected delegates to the city party conference are A.A. Kuvayev, second secretary of the Leninskiy CPSU Raykom; L.B. Krapivina, deputy party committee secretary of "Geofizika" Scientific Production Association; I.I. Melnikov, party committee secretary at Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov; and N.F. Rubtsov, head of the Secretariat of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

We are seeing a sharp rise in the political activity of the popular masses. This is to be explained, in my view, primarily by the fact that ordinary Communists are seeing that what they say has a real influence on the decisions of higher party organs. Direct, secret, and competitive elections have today become a reality.

Moscow Roundtable Discusses Draft Party Rules

90UN1743A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 90 p 2

[Report on roundtable discussion chaired by N. Andreyanova, secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, prepared by V. Kolesov and A. Osinskiy: "Vanguard or Parliamentary?"]

[Text] **A "roundtable" meeting devoted to discussion of the draft party rules has been held in the Moscow Gorkom [city party committee] and Moscow Committee Social and Political Center.**

The following took part in the meeting: A. Zemskov, first secretary of the Khoroshevskiy Raykom [rayon party committee]; A. Gryuntal, secretary of the party organization of the USSR Academy of Sciences Systems Research Scientific Research Institute; G. Gusev, member of the organizing bureau of the Interclub Party Organization; V. Zhukov, head of the Department of Party Building of the Moscow Higher Party School; N. Kiyashchenko, secretary of the party bureau of the USSR Academy of Sciences Philosophy Institute; D. Klementyev, deputy secretary of the party committee of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov; V. Kolesov, consultant of the Moscow Gorkom Organizational-Party and Cadre Work Department; V. Legostayev, consultant of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department; R. Mazepa, secretary of the party committee of the Moscow Aviation Institute imeni S. Ordzhonikidze; V. Maslennikov, senior lecturer at the Moscow Engineering-Physics Institute; O. Obichkin, head of the Department of Party Building of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences; and V. Shmakov, doctoral student of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov.

The "roundtable" meeting was chaired by N. Andreyanova, secretary of the Moscow Gorkom.

[Mazepa] To begin with the preamble, it is incomprehensible to me why the Communist Party is defined as a self-managing social and political organization. The party is purely political, not some self-managing social and political organization, and let's have done with saying it is of all the people.

We have said repeatedly that the draft rules are unfinished and that, to judge by everything, the political scientists and legal experts have done insufficient work on them. All these flaws must necessarily be taken into consideration. And we need to take account primarily of the proposals which in practice realize the power of the party masses.

[Klementyev] "The Communist Party is an alliance of communist fellow thinkers" is tautological. This strikes one immediately. How this could have gotten into the draft rules is incomprehensible.

[Zhukov] I believe that we need to define our position primarily in what is most important. What type of organization are we talking about? There are two

approaches: Either we are now working within the framework of ideas concerning a parliamentary organization or we are talking about a party of the vanguard type. Unless we make our position clear on this matter, we will not reach a serious level of discussion.

[Klementyev] Two versions of the draft rules have been prepared in the Moscow University party organization. In one of them, the main one, the party is of the vanguard type. There is also a short version—dealing with a party of the parliamentary type.

[Mazepa] Let us determine what should be understood by the appellation "vanguard" or "parliamentary" party. It is, after all, no secret that each understands this somewhat in his own way. We do not even have identical terminology here.

[Zhukov] There is no particular difficulty here, I believe. If we take the Democratic Platform, everything contained in its program documents and resolutions reflects a political organization of a parliamentary type. If we take the CPSU Central Committee Platform, granted all its contradictions, we are, for all that, dealing with an organization of a vanguard type. I support the model of the party as a political vanguard force. On the other hand, as far as a party of the parliamentary type is concerned, it confines the range of its activity to two main tasks. First, to promote from its midst notable political leaders; second, to secure their electoral victory.

[Zemskov] It seems to me that the party will in the future be parliamentary. I suggest that we proceed from the fact that a real multiparty system will be introduced, and then speaking of the vanguard role of the CPSU a priority would be naive. At the same time I believe that it is still too early to dispose ourselves solely toward parliamentarianism. Primarily because the party is too big, and very many of its members have become accustomed to working under different conditions. The essence of my suggestion is as follows: It seems to me, we need to take account of the acute transitional nature of our society. And we need to find a mixed option, that is, add, on the basis of the CPSU Rules, to the current party elements of parliamentarianism.

[Maslennikov] It is a very correct observation that the party rules should be geared to transition from a vanguard party to a parliamentary party. Unfortunately, this transition is absent from the draft rules which have been drawn up by the CPSU Central Committee. For example, I would like to observe that given a parliamentary party we would have to operate primarily in the territories, that is, the territorial primary party organizations would become the basis of our party. It is this which would prevent us from losing the elections. But there is practically no such transition here. And unless the situation changes, the party will in the very near future collapse. It will lose everything it could possibly lose.

[Kiyashchenko] But I see no contradictions. Unless the party is a vanguard, it will not be a parliamentary party either. In order to win seats in parliament in the elections it has to offer some ideas and platforms and set some goals which the people can support and believe in and support at the elections. We will, all the same, find it necessary for the party to gain parliamentary experience. There can be no question of real victory under present conditions without it. For this reason all this must be reflected in both the organizational principles themselves and in the composition of the party.

[Gusev] I believe that in drawing up the documents it is necessary, for all that, to proceed from life, not from theory. Then the party really will not lag behind all these processes which we are observing currently. However, the draft rules are composed as some speculative theory which is not based on actual life and the specific realities which have taken shape currently. We are moving toward democracy, toward a multiparty system, but the rules do not take this into account. We need to proceed from the fact that if the rules are adopted in the form in which they have been proposed (and there has been practically no change in their underlying principles), the party as such will cease to exist.

I believe that the goal and tasks of the party are not to win a vanguard position in society but to formulate a strategy for its development which is acceptable to and welcomed by the people.

[Legostayev] In my opinion, it is necessary to ponder and reflect in unison on that to which we refer when we speak about a multiparty system and about a parliamentary-type party. And examine it, what is more, with reference to the specific conditions of the Soviet Union.

First, what we are saying currently about a multiparty system is not a discovery for us. Let us, to the extent this is possible, glance back at history and acknowledge that we are for the second time this century beginning to talk about a multiparty system. It existed in our country as of 1905.

Second, we need to glance at the world also and take a look at the countries which are multiparty. How they are similar to and how they differ from us. It seems to me that we need to see three important particular features distinguishing us from countries in which a multiparty system has evolved historically. First, this means the unprecedentedly vast dimensions of our country. All other countries which could in some sense be equated with the Soviet Union in terms of territory are not essentially multiparty. The United States, for example, would seem to be a multiparty country. But in reality a "duet" of Democrats and Republicans has essentially been in power there for 130 years.

The next aspect. Let us look for a multiparty country which is similar to ours in terms of complexity of national composition. I can assure you that there is none. In any event, we now number just over 100 nations and nationalities in the country. For comparison China, with a population of over 1 billion, has 56 nations and

nationalities. I would like to call attention to the following fact also: All multiparty countries are predominantly homogeneous in the religious respect. There is among them not one in which, as with us, three competing major religious traditions have met: Islam, Orthodoxy and Catholicism, which, incidentally, under the conditions of a multiparty system will become politicized instantly. A situation where the Communist Party has in fact been a mass political movement, which in the structure of the Soviet society has performed perfectly particular positive constitutional functions, has taken shape historically in our country. Which? Primarily the integration of society, second, the internationalization of society. In other words, the all-around structure of the party authorities, international in essence, is a very important factor of the stabilization of social life.

I believe that a multiparty system could develop with us given a predominant political party.

[Obichkin] As far as the preamble is concerned, I believe that the comrades are right to criticize it: It is, after all, the character of the party to some extent. It needs to be clearly indicated whether the party has its own class position. I believe it needs to be said plainly that the party expresses primarily the fundamental interests of the working class. Second, this does not contradict the fact that the party expresses the fundamental vital interests of the vast majority of the people. And, third, it simultaneously champions ideals and values common to all mankind.

Finally, I believe, it is necessary to say clearly in the preamble what goal the party pursues. Yes, it remains true to the communist ideal and now sets the task of the development of socialism.

[Gryuntal] Despite the main democratic procedures which mitigate the current rigid structure, the essence of the draft rules remains the same as before, that is, a congress once every five years, the congress elects the Central Committee and the decisions of the Central Committee and even its presidium are mandatory for all communists. There has in fact been no change in the principle of democratic centralism.

This draft retains such a clause as "party organizations in the Armed Forces, the KGB and so forth." But this means the party's direct influence on the state structure. This should not be the case. There are many other complaints also. Essentially the draft preserves the territorial-production structure. The role of the party's supervisory authorities is diminished, that is, they are intended to monitor individual party members, not the party executive bodies, which they should do.

[Zhukov] The main thing, which I wholeheartedly support in both the draft platform and the draft rules, is the idea of realizing the power of the party masses.

The organizational-political mechanism on which the realization of this idea is based in the proposed documents is another matter. From my viewpoint, what we have here is a very local, ragbag idea on this score which fails to imbibe that entire wealth of intellectual potential which has been engendered by the conditions of the debate. Very many standpoints here are either expounded insufficiently thoroughly or are directly contrary to the logic of the democratization of intra-party relations and the establishment of the power of the party masses.

We speak, for example, of the enhanced role of the collective bodies of party leadership in the sphere of intraparty relations. But to what extent does this accord with the introduction of the office of party chairman? From the standpoint of the logic of intraparty relations this idea is totally inexplicable. It may be explained only from the standpoints of the subsequent convenience of a combination of offices.

And, further, I am profoundly convinced that orientation toward a parliamentary-type party in the aspect in which it is viewed currently is deliberate political suicide (considering all the factors about which V. Legostayev spoke so convincingly). And there is no need to dissemble. If we have so far understood little in this respect, we should be properly investigating.

Now is not the time to be campaigning for or against a multiparty system. The entire political leadership of our party in recent years has contributed to the creation of the conditions for a multiparty system. This process is currently at the initial stage of development. But it will take, I believe, a minimum of two or three years for the actual formation of a multiparty system. And then the customary picture, familiar to any political scientist, will begin: A struggle among various political parties for the establishment of political domination will commence. It is not hard to grasp what this will mean for our country with all the factors and conditions which have just been mentioned. The consequences could be most undesirable.

[Shmakov] I agree that we need to convert the party truly into a vanguard party, that is, one which represents and expresses the wishes and interests of the party masses. And then the question of democratic centralism arises. Departing from this principle today is, most likely, impossible. But it has also to be seen that the words "democratic centralism" are not now accepted by society.

[Maslennikov] I would like to begin with general impressions of the draft rules. They contain several compromises. The first compromise is between the desires of the communist rank and file to really influence party policy and the endeavor of the apparatus to keep everything at the previous level.

Second, on the one hand the desire of the union republic communist parties to obtain a certain independence, on the other, the desire of the center to consolidate its positions.

And these compromises which have been found are not, it seems to me, all that fortunate. The rules remind me of some plan of a building which outwardly looks very attractive. But if one investigates and does the actual sums, such a structure cannot stand. From my viewpoint, the foundation is very weak, the walls, too thick, and the dome, altogether of ferroconcrete.

Why does it seem to me that this building's foundation is puny? First, because it is possible in accordance with these rules to join and leave the party without any restrictions. The final decision is made by the primary organization. There are now no sponsors, who earlier, in accordance with the rules, bore party responsibility. Provision is not made for an initiation contribution. That is, this means that it is altogether possible to join and leave the party without undue fuss.

Freedom to pay party dues at any convenient time is being instituted. It was said earlier that three months late, and the question of expulsion from the party would be raised. But now no timeframe is stipulated at all, and one may not pay one's dues for as long as one likes.

The periodicity of party meetings is not determined, this being decided by the primary party organization itself. But will it not result in the communists assembling once a year?

Now about the thick walls. The principle of democratic centralism, even if we are excluding it from the wording, may still be clearly traced in all its power.

And, finally, concerning the ferroconcrete dome. We have never before had a situation where a party chairman has been elected who may not be replaced by the Central Committee. It transpires that the party chairman, who is elected at the congress, commands the Central Committee and is not accountable to it. Presidential rule is being established in the party. This is nonsense.

[Mazepa] Communists of our party organization believe that, taken as a whole, the rules are, of course, very eroded and that there is little in them that is specific and, what is most important, much that is ill-considered. It is necessary first of all to clearly formulate the goal, the appellation. In our view, the addition to socialism of all kinds of adjectives: humane, democratic, developed and so forth, is altogether unacceptable. It is either socialism or it is not socialism. And let us say that what we have is, indeed, not socialism. This is where we need to begin.

A few words about the principle of democratic centralism. I believe that we should undoubtedly abandon the appellation. And we need to formulate differently the principles of the party's organizational composition also. But the party must be preserved as an organization, that is, seniority should be determined. There must be discipline. At the same time, however, it is essential to ensure the right of the minority to defend its viewpoint and platform. I believe, however, that factions are impermissible, particularly under the conditions of a multiparty system.

Concerning the power of the party masses. It seems to me that what is in the rules is far from the realization of this power.

Concerning vertical and horizontal structures. The structure of power is vertical, and for this reason the structure of the party authorities should be vertical also. That work in various horizontal structures should be permitted is another matter.

A further question: Are party organizations needed at the enterprises? They are since it is essential to leave communists with an opportunity to organize at the workplace also. At the same time, however, it is undoubtedly also necessary to shift the center of gravity to work in the territories because deputies are being elected territorially, and this has to be taken into consideration.

[Kolesov] First, I would like to mention that the present rules are considerably "thinner," I mean in volume, by approximately one-third. This is a plus of the draft rules. They do not, as does the previous version, regulate in as much detail the activity of the party organizations and the local and central party authorities, leaving extensive opportunities for creativity. However, I believe it essential that the draft clearly delineate the jurisdiction of the central, local, and primary organizations. When this is done, the primary organizations will make the final decisions within their jurisdiction, and no one may influence them any longer.

Mention has already been made here of horizontal structures. The rules give the illusion of, let us put it this way, their possible existence. But how will they be formed? I would like in this connection to call attention once again to the territorial and production principles of composition. Let us think: What if the primary party organizations could be formed in accordance with three principles: the communist's place of residence, his place of work or his interests, like today's party clubs, for example? Of course, this proposal requires additional study and development, but the question of vertical and horizontal structures would in this case be resolved. Not the confrontation of these two types of structures, as some people, comrades from the Democratic Platform included, are currently attempting to portray matters (horizontal are good, vertical, bad), but their interaction and complementariness.

[Obichkin] It is essential that the rules make obligatory provisions which no one can circumvent. Such that any violation of a specific provision and the specific rights of an individual and party member necessarily entail both a particular penalty and liability.

And, of course, I agree with those who deem it necessary to insert in the rules a special section—on control and auditing commissions, which clearly determines their rights. We could in this sense, I believe, avail ourselves

also of our party's great historical experience. We have had such as, say, the obligatory convening of joint plenums of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission and the right of members of the Central Control Commission Presidium to attend all meetings of the Central Committee Politburo. The right of members of the Central Control Commission to attend plenums of any party committee, beginning with the Central Committee, and all party meetings, conferences, and congresses on a nonvoting basis.

[Zemskov] Briefly about the matter in hand. The preamble should, it seems to me, be written on the basis of the Democratic Platform. It is more correct and precise. Only the ultimate goals need to be added. I support the right of free secession and the right to information. I would ask that consideration be given to the communist's right to defend his good name and honor. It should be recorded directly that the party, as an organization, is obliged to defend the honor, dignity, and legitimate interests of its members.

I do not support an inflation of the role of the control and auditing commission. I do not in fact believe that we need such a commission at this time. This was necessary when we were a monopoly party. Now, first, the separation of the functions of party and state lessens the mass of dangerous obligations from this viewpoint. Second, big rights are being transferred to the primaries, and there is no need to monitor them. And, what is most important, the multiparty system: We will have the best inspector one could devise.

In speaking today of parties of the vanguard or parliamentary type many of us invest these terms with varying meaning, which, among other things, was noted by the participants in the "roundtable" meeting also. Our joint deliberations and, of course, the expert assistance of political scientist specialists are needed here.

Luzhkov Elected Mossovet Ispolkom Chairman

WA1505191190 Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 27 Apr 90 p 4

[V. Chaava report: "'Let Us Work!'"]

[Text] An event of considerable importance occurred yesterday in the life of the deputies of the Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet]: Those whose authority had been confirmed by the credentials commission were issued deputies' badges and permanent certifications.

The actual work of yesterday's meeting once again began with discussion of Article 7 of the Provisional Regulations on Standing Commissions of the Mossovet. We recall that a clause thereof causing the most debate concerns the possibility (or impossibility) of leading officials holding any paid positions outside the structure of the Mossovet. Four versions of this clause of the article were on the agenda simultaneously. And once again the spread of the vote prevented any decision being made. Work on the article will continue today.

The composition of 18 standing commissions was approved following the first break.

The evening meeting was devoted to a key question of yesterday's agenda—election of the chairman of the Mossovet Ispolkom [Executive Committee]. Deputy G.Kh. Popov, who chaired the meeting, proposed that those present examine the candidacy of Yuriy Mikhaylovich Luzhkov, acting chairman of the Mossovet Ispolkom.

Those who are closely following the session could have familiarized themselves via television yesterday with the content of his "election" speech. We, however, would like to focus your attention on certain of its key propositions, in our view. The candidate for chairman of the ispolkom said, inter alia:

"There is no need, I believe, to go over yet again the sore points in the city organism, but it is important to mention three salient features of the current situation:

"First, the general trend toward deterioration, which is particularly frightening in the city. Today's situation is a consequence of decisions adopted five to seven years ago.

"Second, the increased impact on the city of outside factors worsening the situation connected with the supply of food, consumer goods, and industrial products.

"Third, our own mistakes, when, instead of real organizational and economic work, we engaged in a change of signboards, names, and structures...

"It is essential to fundamentally change the system of management of the city and afford the enterprises freedom of activity and a choice of structures and forms of management in practice. Then the enterprises themselves will not retain superfluous managerial components. We need to create conditions conducive to the development of small, leased, and family businesses oriented toward the needs of the population and freely managing and operating on the market...

"It is extraordinarily important until the main condition of a normal market has taken shape—the excess of supply over demand—to find a mechanism of regulating the maximum level of prices and rates for goods and services of vital importance to Muscovites..."

The candidate spoke in his speech about the serious ecological situation in the city and the problems of health care and social protection of the needy strata of the population. Concerning the enlistment of non-Muscovites at the capital's enterprises, he observed that ultimately such a policy, practiced for decades, has done nothing for the city other than to sharply exacerbate the housing crisis.

It was ascertained during the tallying of votes that of the 360 deputies who took part in the vote on Yu.M. Luzhkov's candidacy, 297 supported him.

Yu.M. Luzhkov's closing remarks were exceedingly brief. And all those present in the hall would certainly have subscribed to his closing words, "let us work!"

Today the morning meeting began, as usual, with discussion of the agenda. A number of deputies once again raised the issue of House No. 20/22 in Sivtsevaya Vrazhka, around which passions in the city are seething. Built for high-ranking officials, it has for several days now been "blockaded" by large families from Kiyevskiy Rayon.

Replying to a question from the deputies, Yu.M. Luzhkov, elected yesterday chairman of the Mossovet Ispolkom, reported that a decision had been adopted and dispatched to the Kiyevskiy Rayon Soviet Ispolkom on the transfer of this house to large families and Afghan veterans.

Gidaspov Delivers Report to Leningrad Conference

90UN1835A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 90 pp 1-3

[Report by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom, at joint conference of Leningrad Oblast and City party organization on 25 April 1990]

[Text] Comrade Delegates!

The oblast and Leningrad city committees of the CPSU are reporting to you on their incomplete half-year's work. This is not an automatic departure from the two-year cycle which has taken shape traditionally. The times in which we are living are imperiously rejecting many of the rules and statutes which were previously customary.

We are seeing this by the day and by the hour. Last December even the proposal concerning revocation of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution had not at that time "passed," and the multiparty system came to be officially recognized only as of February.

Insistent appeals for the cohesion and unity of the party ranks were being heard quite recently. But there is now a clear understanding also that a common program for people who are currently members of the CPSU is nothing more than an unrealizable fantasy.

Returning to the material of the recent report and election conferences of the oblast and city party organizations, it may be said today that as of January last year objective social processes have been canceling out a considerable part of our long-term plans and studies.

And not only ours. Many of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress have in fact become nonviable, and certain guidelines of the 19th party conference are not being implemented.

What should the concept of the report be under these conditions? Is it appropriate to reduce it merely to an account of the fulfillment of specific points of the decisions of preceding conferences?

I think not.

It would seem far more important to submit for your judgment the collective assessments determined in the course of debate of the situation which has taken shape in the Leningrad party organization and reflection on the possible consequences of the present development of the political and socioeconomic situation and the ways of making the CPSU a political force capable of overcoming the present crisis.

Our country is living through a difficult, dramatic period. The process of the radical renewal and restructuring of society that began five years ago was objectively necessary and natural. Millions of Soviet people linked with it their hopes for a better, worthier life.

Today few people believe in swift salutary changes.

The romantic period of perestroyka is over. Polar viewpoints on socialism have emerged distinctly—from a resolve to come to its defense through its total rejection.

We are living at a time of the birth of a new political system.

Official propaganda and party commentary are dealing, as before, with the "socialism with a human face" and "humane socialism" concepts and similar quite nebulous semantic constructs.

Yet no careful proprietor would build a home without having at least approximate drawings of it. But this commandment has been either forgotten or simply swept aside.

As a result it is increasingly coming to be a matter not only of distortions and mistakes of the past but also of serious miscalculations of recent years.

It seems that the endless period of economic experiments should be leading us out of the crisis labyrinth, but the difficult experience of our perestroyka shows that the chosen path of trial and error is not as yet producing tangible fruit.

None of this is, naturally, adding to the population's optimism but is undermining its trust in the authorities and on the one hand sowing pessimism and apathy and, on the other, evoking bitterness and aggressiveness.

There are more than sufficient grounds for negative evaluations. Living has become harder for all, except perhaps for corrupt officials and smart operators of the shadow economy.

The country is being shaken by interethnic conflicts, and the blood of totally innocent people is being shed. The events in Tbilisi, Nagornyy-Karabakh, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the Baltics have brought the situation to the boiling point and in a number of instances have sent it

out of control. The dreadful word "refugees" has once again, as in the troubled times of war, become a reality.

Society has found itself under the severest oppression of general shortages—economic and moral. There is a decline in labor, performance, contract discipline, and public morals. Legal and ideological nihilism is flourishing, particularly among the youth. The orgy of crime has reached crisis point. The scale of ecological catastrophes is having an oppressive impact on the public frame of mind.

Social defenselessness and lack of confidence in the future are pushing people into mysticism and religiosity. Belief in our own powers is giving way to a belief in miracles.

Our troubles, difficulties, and disorders have been the catalyst of the emergence in the political arena of new forces whose antisocialist orientation is not in doubt. Skillfully manipulating public opinion and playing on people's anxiety at the tension in the sociopolitical sphere and the crisis phenomena in the economy, they are endeavoring to compromise the party and deprive it of the support of the masses, while at the same time attempting to form and expand their own social base among the population—and successfully, in a number of instances.

The party is not an island in our country's political life. The crisis phenomena in society are reflected in its current state also. The crisis of the CPSU has reached the point beyond which the question "To be or not to be?" has for the party itself become a reality. It is no longer a party of the like-minded. Party discipline has weakened, and the ideals to whose achievement we summoned the people have proven eroded. All this has undermined and continues to undermine the credit of trust in the CPSU.

Having encompassed the whole party, the crisis could not have failed to have made itself felt in the Leningrad party organization.

We have frequently heard recently about the party's global responsibility for the mistakes of the past and the need for its repentance and proceedings against even party members.

Moral pressure is being felt by many communists, and not all are withstanding it. A worrying symptom of the crisis is the voluntary renunciation of party affiliation.

As of the latter six months of 1988, the number of communists who have submitted applications to leave the CPSU ranks and handed in their party papers has grown considerably. Whereas 515 communists quit the CPSU in Leningrad and the oblast in 1988, more than 8,000 did so in 1989.

The largest number of those who have surrendered their party papers is in the party organizations of Vasileostrovskiy, Kalininskiy, Kirovskiy, Moskovskiy, and Nevskiy Rayons and the cities of Gatchinskaya, Kingiseppskaya, Tikhvinskaya, and Sosnovoborskaya.

Almost one-fifth of those who have submitted applications to leave cited as the main reasons a reluctance to pay membership dues; approximately the same number specified their poor state of health, 13 percent declined to perform party assignments, and approximately 16 percent were dissatisfied with the progress of perestroyka. Among those who have quit, over half are workers and more than 40 percent were in the party for 20 years and more.

We could attempt to console ourselves with the fact that it is turncoats and those with weak nerves who are leaving. There are such, it is true; but are they the majority? For a multitude of people who have quit the party this decision was not easy. It frequently became for them a personal drama. We will hardly find among the workers who have left the party many careerists and turncoats.

We are today witnessing an extensive demarcation of social forces, which is intensifying as the party congress approaches.

The complexity of the moment is further determined by the fact that negative phenomena in the economy and the social sphere are on the rise.

In the absence of a well-oiled management mechanism the obkom and gorkom [oblast and city party committees] bureau and the secretariat have frequently had to operate by extra-economic, administrative methods.

We have not—to be blunt—succeeded in sharply rectifying the state of affairs. The region's ties to the whole country are too closely interwoven. It is important, however, that the consistent line in the economy and social policy which was formulated has made it possible to lessen the strain on the consumer market and in providing the population with food.

The structural maneuver in production has secured an acceleration of the development of our consumer sector. Thus the average annual rate of increase in Group "B" products in the period which has elapsed exceeded the increase in the volume of Group "A" by a factor of 1.4.

It has been possible to increase the extent of the investments in the social sphere thanks to a reduction in centralized state capital investments in industrial construction.

Such modern organizational forms in industry as consortia, state enterprise associations, and leasing are gaining momentum. The first agro-industrial companies, which have initiated the integration of the industrial and agrarian sectors of the economy, have been formed.

Other political decisions formulated by the party authorities are engendering positive improvements also. The delegates have detailed information on these matters; permit me, therefore, not to dwell further on this subject.

The logic of the development of events brought us to the need for the formulation of clear priorities in the ideological and socioeconomic spheres, by which the communists should be guided under current conditions.

The democratization of intraparty life and social and production life and the search for points of contact and interaction with the informal organizations and the population at the place of residence demanded new approaches.

The role and place of the main component of the party—the primary organizations—in the production structures and their financial situation and relations with the workforce councils, unions, and superior party organizations constituted a special group of difficult questions.

An interpretation of the accumulated problems and an endeavor to change the current situation were the basis of the platform of the Leningrad party organization. You all know full well how it was created. There is no need, I believe, to dwell on this in detail.

I would remind you merely that the source of it was the meeting of party activists in the Tavricheskiy Palace. And the period from August through November, when the joint obkom and gorkom plenum adopted a document which had acquired quite clear contours, was suffused with debate of unprecedented intensity in all components of the Leningrad party organization and with tremendous analytical work on the collation and consideration of hundreds of thousands of the communists' proposals and observations.

Our platform evoked an ambivalent reaction both in the party and in society. There was support, and there was criticism too—far from always fair and constructive, unfortunately. Some people were in a hurry to discern in the document and the party mass meeting held after the plenum a policy aimed at confrontation with the center and separatist aspirations. The so-called "democratic press" did not let slip the opportunity to resort to labeling, outright fact-juggling, and far-fetched accusations.

But let this remain on the conscience of those who plunged into dissipation for the sake of satisfying their personal ambitions—although, incidentally, these people were quite successful in confusing public opinion.

Time, however, has put many things in their place. The propositions of the action program of Leningrad's communists accord with the CPSU Central Committee draft and go further on a number of fundamental points.

And now also, six months after the adoption of the platform of the Leningrad party organization, we may maintain with sufficient grounds that we were not mistaken in our choice of strategic directions.

Joint plenums of the obkom and the gorkom have become habitual. Panels under the auspices of our committees made up of members of their elective bodies have begun to work actively. All important activities, this conference included, have been prepared with the enlistment of the activists of Leningrad's communists at large and the organization of sociological surveys and party referendums.

On matters of the democratization of intraparty life, the obkom has endeavored to take and has actually taken specific steps. Some powers of the superior party committees have been handed over to the primary party organizations. Recommended agendas of party meetings have ceased to be a practice, questions of the communists' enlistment in party responsibility are decided only by the party organizations, and members of the elective party bodies have begun to render account before the communists more frequently.

People working in the apparatus have passed fitness reports, and many have remained on the party register in the organizations which sent them into party work. The majority are highly qualified people with the necessary experience and knowledge.

On the initiative of the obkom and gorkom the system of elections to conferences and leading party authorities of all levels has been changed fundamentally and democratized. We have all been convinced of this by our own experience.

We are being reproached for the fact that we lacked the persistence and purposefulness for the consistent implementation of all that is planned in the platform. We have to agree with this opinion. Both our own organizational blunders and the absence in many party members of the skills of political struggle were reflected also. It is today, after all, a question precisely of struggle, not simply of political work.

But the essence of the matter, it would seem, lies far deeper. There are two fundamental points.

First, the adoption of the platform was considerably late. Had it appeared before the March 1989 elections, events might possibly have developed differently.

Second, we were unable to preserve and develop that "peak" of political tone of the Leningrad party organization which was connected with the elaboration and adoption of our action program under current conditions and carry this "peak" over in full to the organizational sphere.

On the threshold of the new election campaign the obkom and gorkom were unable to engage in such meaningful action as would have ensured that the Communists acted in a united front with their common platform. We all know the results.

The conclusion which suggests itself from what has been said is unambiguous: The root of all evil in our work is the lack of dynamism and orientation toward the future. We are acting by proceeding from circumstances taking shape as of the given moment and failing to calculate in advance possible versions of the development of events.

Meanwhile the departure from the evolved stereotypes is being accomplished extremely slowly. The CPSU Central Committee is no exception here.

The publication of the draft Central Committee platform and the Central Committee open letter to the country's communists was late. As far as the latter document is concerned, our position—and we expressed it—is that it should have been adopted collegially, following comprehensive and considered balanced discussion at Central Committee plenums. However, our opinion was not heeded.

The time that was lost resulted in a strengthening of the centrifugal forces in the party, which have in fact brought it to the brink of a split.

Our political opponents, including from the "Democratic Platform," the leaders of which are frankly preaching renunciation of the Leninist principles of the party's composition, the implantation of factionalism, and transition to a parliamentary type of development, picked up propaganda points.

The mere fact of its appearance earlier than the draft prepared by the CPSU Central Committee confirms yet again the simple truth that the winner in politics is frequently whoever gets out in front. The Democratic Platform immediately attracted the public's attention and in many party organizations set the tone of the election debate.

I will say frankly that under these complex conditions the draft CPSU Central Committee platform failed to fully justify our expectations. The very first discussions in the party organizations of Leningrad and the oblast rapidly revealed the draft's main shortcoming: it is too declarative and is written in the language of theoretical abstractions unintelligible to the masses at large.

The Central Committee platform failed to display a clear-cut position on the main issues troubling the communists and all Soviet people. The prospects of social development appear vague and uncertain, as before.

All this increased the intensity of the polemic. In the stream of polar judgments and opinions new platforms, explaining in their fashion the essence of the period in which we are living, began to appear one after another.

As many of you most likely know, an action congress of Russia's communists was held here in Leningrad last Saturday and Sunday. Profound concern for the fate of the party and the country was heard and a multitude of viewpoints on today's political situation also emerged there.

In our view, the time has come to integrate all that is positive that has been formulated by social thought and to create, possibly, and present to the congress a new version of the Leningrad program.

In this connection the proposal expressed by delegates in the course of meetings on the creation from the ranks of participants in our conference of a commission to collate the Communists' opinions on the CPSU platform and rules by our second meeting this June merits attention.

Collating the results of the meetings of primary party organizations, rayon CPSU conferences, and the letters of many thousands of communists and nonparty people, we may confidently highlight the central feature of all discussions: the question of the crisis in the party.

The party will be unable to gain its "second wind" without a fundamental evaluation of it and without a choice of paths for overcoming it adequate to the critical moment.

It is obvious today that while preserving formal affiliation to a united party we have frequently begun to argue bitterly and conduct an ideological struggle, which was manifested particularly clearly in the course of the recent elections to the republic and local soviets. And the results of the elections to the Leningrad City Soviet are convincing: While having obtained a majority, the communists in it are disconnected by factions and are frequently opposed to one another.

Thus a split in the CPSU could become a reality. Not to see this is to be in the grip of illusions. And they, as Lenin said, always lead in politics to perdition.

How, then, to avoid this danger? Some political strategists are calling on us to take the path of renunciation of the principle of democratic centralism—the main culprit, in their opinion, of all the troubles of the party and society. At the same time they propose that the party be composed on a federalist basis.

Such a solution of the problem would, in our view, be disastrous for the CPSU. And the majority of party organizations of Leningrad and the oblast is at one with us on this. Renunciation of the principle of democratic centralism would deprive the party of its organizational basis and make it possible to pull it apart bit by bit. The federalist principle of the composition of the CPSU, on the other hand, would merely accelerate the separatist aspirations of a number of Union republics, which has already been graphically demonstrated by the experience of Lithuania.

Of course, the principle of democratic centralism which we advocate today should differ fundamentally from the diktat of the top echelons which has actually taken shape in our party, when bureaucratic centralism has essentially been predominant. It is not a question of the principle itself here but of its distortion in the years of Stalinism and stagnation.

Let us not forget that when the party was guided by Lenin, democratic centralism was a guarantee of the exercise of the power of the party masses and the primary organizations and an assurance of relations of comradeship and party equality.

It was recognizably attainable unity which enabled the party in the Lenin years to maintain its fighting efficiency at the abrupt turns of history. This is not the case now, when bureaucratic centralism has found itself broken, and, given the absence of conscious unity and conscious discipline, the party has in the hour of difficult trials lost the initiative.

Renunciation of the true, Leninist principle of democratic centralism could turn the party into an amorphous formation and bring it to self-liquidation, which would be tragically dangerous not only for the CPSU but also for all of society, in which signs of anarchy have already appeared.

The decline in discipline in the party and society is an interrelated process. When the principle of democratic centralism is criticized, the main emphasis is put on the power of the party apparatus. To say that it has disappeared would be to sin against the truth. The mentality of party bureaucratism has not yet disappeared.

Recently, however, the demands on the party officials on the part of the communists, as well as nonparty persons, have grown sharply. Ever-increasing attention is being paid to personal qualities: scrupulousness, an ability to uphold one's position in tight situations, and a capacity for conducting a constructive dialogue with the masses and representatives of other political forces. Nonetheless, even today some people remain in the grip of dogmas and outdated stereotypes.

At the same time, however, it has become obvious that criticism of the apparatus and its style, forms, and methods of work has grown into outright defamation and reached the stage of moral terror. The term "apparatchik" has become the small change in the struggle for deputies' seats. Candidates' affiliation to party authorities frequently condemned them to obvious defeat.

We are convinced that the new Leningrad Obkom, like local party committees, will not manage without a competent apparatus possessing a high political culture either.

For the training of such officials there must be a fundamental change in the system of instruction of party personnel. Emphasis needs to be put on a strengthening of the ideological-moral, analytical, and psychological aspects of the instruction. In this connection, proposals concerning a reconstruction of the entire system of training and retraining of party personnel merit the closest scrutiny: specifically, the reorganization of the Higher Party School, the University of Marxism-Leninism, and the Political Education Center into a new type of institute with modern programs providing for the training of political officials of the party who know how to act under the conditions of a multiparty system and a multistructure economy and who have a good command of Marxist-Leninist methodology.

As far as the number of officials and the structure of the apparatus are concerned, they should be determined by proceeding from the goals of the party committee and the functions ensuing from them. The main thing, however, is that under the conditions of the democratization of all of party life the apparatus must be the executive body of the corresponding party committees.

Decisive measures were implemented in the period under review to ensure that the executive bodies of the obkom and gorkom met these requirements. The sectoral structure of the departments was abolished and standing commissions of the obkom and gorkom were created, which made it possible to make practical progress in the subordination of the apparatus to the elective party authorities.

A process of the merger of the obkom and gorkom in a single party committee is under way. The vast majority of Leningrad's communists supported this in the course of a referendum. The present conference will have to make the final decision on this matter.

An appreciable reduction in the strength and a merger of parallel departments of the obkom and gorkom were conducted recently. It is now a matter of the apparatus being up to the high intellectual, political, and moral demands that are made of it. The newly elected obkom should perform this work thoroughly and carefully. We hope that the conference will approve this approach.

I will permit myself a short digression. I know that I am frequently charged with being inconsistent and contradictory in my opinions and statements on this serious question of social and political life or the other.

I would answer thus: The position of a "centrist" (since we have begun increasingly to resort to half-forgotten terminology) has always been and will continue to be the most exposed target for criticism—from both the left and the right.

This is how it is.

But tell me, can we allow to happen in Leningrad what has already become the bitter reality and pain of many of our nations and nationalities and even of the whole country?

Or perhaps some people have some ready prescriptions for the removal of social tension and the preservation of equilibrium in our agitated home?

I personally am prepared to pay any price for them, for the tranquillity of the region. But I fear that there is simply no one to pay.

As a result of the past elections the obkom has been replaced to the extent of more than 80 percent. It is merely that there are extremely few workers and members of the artistic intelligentsia in the obkom which puts us on our guard.

But despite all this, there are good prerequisites for a renewal of the style and methods of its activity.

Experience shows that new tasks requiring fundamentally new approaches and methods should be tackled by new personnel also, in the main. Restructuring is very difficult for many leaders formed over decades under the conditions of political and ideological ease. Stereotypes of thinking and behavior are proving stronger than the appeals and slogans of perestroyka.

But selecting new people is not easy, either. The main cause of everything is the absence of a well-oiled mechanism of the search for and promotion of gifted politicians and organizers. Such an attempt was made at the Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, but it was not realized in practice either in the Central Committee itself or locally.

What conclusions should be drawn from what has been said?

First, it is necessary to firmly uphold and implement the practice of the election of party leaders on a multiple-choice basis, with regard for the platforms and programs they offer. That is, all that we observed in the course of the election campaign—only on a more civilized and respectful level—also needs to be implemented in party life.

Second, the arrival of new party leaders should also mean an appreciable renewal of the apparatus, which will be a kind of protection against stagnation and traditionalism.

And finally third, healthy competition will force those who lay claim to leadership to seek support and strength in the primary party organizations, whose presence can alone be the guarantor thereof.

The question of questions is the relationship of party committees of different levels. Communists consider it necessary in the resolutions of the meetings and conferences held recently to markedly broaden the rights of the primary party organizations and afford them more independence in the solution of intraparty matters such as admittance to and expulsion from the ranks of the CPSU, financial activity, and the creation of secretary councils.

The legitimacy of the very existence of raykoms [rayon party committees] has been questioned and proposals concerning their replacement with other structures, without an apparatus, have been put forward in some rayons.

It needs to be said in this connection that much of what has been proposed should be expressed in the decisions of our conference. We must really think about the mechanism of reallocation of rights and strong authority in favor of the primary party organizations, horizontal structures, and elective bodies. The participation of the communists in the process of shaping political life should be organized on a regular and systematic basis. It is essential to reserve for the primary party organizations, party committees, and secretary councils the right to draw up and submit for examination by the raykoms and obkoms their own versions of resolutions and decisions pertaining to fundamental issues of party life. The possibility of delegating representatives of the primary party organizations to meetings of plenums of all levels should be stipulated and their access to the majority of documents adopted by superior party authorities ensured.

I believe that the raykoms should in the immediate future be preserved in the party structure since it is difficult to see the obkom being able to encompass organizationally the more than 5,000 primary organizations.

The renewed obkom should become a kind of think tank and intellectual center for formulation of the strategic line and tactics in the political struggle, in the molding of public opinion, and in ideological-educational work.

Political analysis departments, sociological and economic offices and subdivisions responsible for the training of personnel and their tuition in new political methods, the art of debate, and so forth should in this connection move to the forefront in the party's organizational structures.

The obkom should have the opportunity to attract on a contract basis the best intellectual forces for an analysis of unfolding situations in this sphere or the other and formulating long-term solutions.

A subject of special concern and attention is the social base of the CPSU. Without a clear answer to this question today we run the risk of leaving the party without a future. Under the conditions of differentiation of political interests the struggle for the attraction to the CPSU of the most populous social strata will undoubtedly intensify. And we need to be ready for such a struggle.

The CPSU has in the years of Soviet power changed from being a party of the working class into a party of all working people. But we cannot today forget about the first principle of the party and under no circumstances slacken our activity among the workers. Yet the facts stubbornly testify to a decline in the prestige of the CPSU among the workers. It is here that the largest outflow from the party is being observed and political apathy is growing. On the other hand, there is an increase in extremism and anarchic spontaneity. This trend has been manifested increasingly distinctly of late. Attempts to create among the workers organizations alternative to the CPSU—from left radicals and "independent" trade unions to ultraright political organizations—are multiplying.

Even more complex processes are being encountered currently among the intelligentsia, which is essentially the generator of the political pluralism. Under present conditions this occurrence is natural, but we do not have the right to be detached observers of it. Otherwise the CPSU runs the risk of losing a considerable proportion

of the progressive intelligentsia carried away by the slogans of other political parties and public movements.

This is doubly important for the Leningrad party organization inasmuch as tremendous scientific-technological and creative potential and competent, highly skilled worker and specialist personnel are concentrated in it. Manifestly insufficient use has been made of them up to the present, which cannot be called anything other than intolerable waste.

This is why, in our view, a central feature of the activity of Leningrad's Communists should be a movement for Leningrad's cultural revival broadly understood as radical reform of the system of education and schooling incorporating the entire chain of man's formation—from the family and kindergarten through the higher educational institutions and our ideological and social institutions. It is into this sphere that the priority channeling of material and intellectual resources is needed.

A particular question concerns a well-considered CPSU youth policy. Without it the party has no future, and this was shown clearly by the 21st VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Congress which has just been held. Following difficult, dramatic debate, the future of the Communist Youth League has remained uncertain. The compromise reached at the congress is unstable and is fraught with division at any moment.

Under these conditions it is essential that we probe in greater depth the processes under way among the youth and persuasively establish in them the ideas of the socialist choice made by the older generations. We cannot allow the history of the land of soviets to represent for the young a dead weight of mistakes and terror—there can be no compromise with our opponents here.

On the other hand, attempting to keep contemporary youth in the grip of ideological doctrines without having offered it ideas for the future is impossible. The mobility of the youth mentality and the radical nature and enterprise of the youth—it is essential to direct all this into a constructive channel and afford the young people an opportunity to display their powers in the real creative process. We need to ascertain the informal leaders of the youth, in the nonleague milieu included, enlist them in political activity, and prepare our replacement shift from them.

It would evidently be expedient for the new obkom to have a youth problems commission headed by a secretary.

The mass media have a key role in the accomplishment of all the tasks confronting us.

The argument concerning a so-called free press is today confusing no one in this hall, I would assume. We would do better to recall the windows of the kiosks and newsstands—merely the titles of the new publications: "Black Banner," "Anti-Soviet Truth," "Alarm Bell". Their anti-party orientation is obvious. And, alongside, newspapers ranking themselves as independent and nonparty: "Rush Hour" and "Man of Letters" and bulletins of the national Baltic fronts. The total print run of all these publications is enormous—hundreds of thousands of issues a day. And it is perfectly clear that, whoever their publisher is, this whole press is of a party nature and champions the interests of particular politicized groups of people.

Recognition of current realities demands of us not a pluralist flirting with the alternative forces but most active work on the defense of the political interests of the Leningrad CPSU organization. And this is most effective when done through the press, primarily our own, party, press.

We have to have here, I believe, an appreciable restructuring of journalism. The struggle of the CPSU for the masses, which has of late become real, not imaginary, demands a different quality of party work, of the party media included. And we know that Leningraders, while noting the indisputable positive aspects in the activity of our press, are increasingly expressing concern at the trends being manifested in it of negativism and the sensationalism of the publications to the detriment of analysis, responsibility, and depth of study of the complex processes occurring in society.

To take our main newspapers, impassiveness and slowness in evaluating the tumultuous events and processes have to a considerable extent lessened the influence of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA on the frame of mind of the communists and nonparty people. This newspaper has ceased to be the main political tribune of the Leningrad party organization. LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY, in turn, is failing to perform the function of socially oriented party publication and to champion the interests of the working class. Nor does the journal DIALOG have an actively expressed position. Ideological erosion and a commercial bent are being manifested increasingly clearly in the content of the local press organs and rayon and plant radio programs.

It should be emphasized once again that the structure of the press which has existed in Leningrad and the oblast is outmoded at all levels. Under the new conditions objective necessity dictates the breakup of the founders of our mass media and their publishing base.

This by no means signifies that we should encourage the instantaneous severance of the relations which have existed until now. What is needed is painstaking, thoughtful work on the harmonization of the legal and economic aspects of the problem. But the Leningrad party organization is simply obliged to do everything for the protection of its party publications and the Communist journalists working at them. That this issue is not contrived but prompted by life itself is indicated if only by the events surrounding the party press in the GDR and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, and the

instances of the outright persecution of communist journalists by the new authorities. We do not have the right to permit such a development of events with us, which is perfectly realistic, considering the changes in the structure of the press in the region.

The just complaints of the gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations leveled at the "Lenizdat" Obkom Publishing House, which prints the newspapers of other public organizations to the detriment of many party papers. All this is also forcing us to take a new look at the very status of "Lenizdat."

Specific steps pertaining to a change in this status should, of course, be discussed with the publishing house's printing worker outfit and the CPSU Central Committee, on whose budget the "Lenizdat" currently operates. It would be expedient, probably, to make this publishing house a joint-stock property of the party organizations of Leningrad and the oblast in order to ensure the party publishing house's actual ties to the party masses. Preference for party publications should be obligatory at the time of formation of the portfolio of the "Lenizdat's" commissions.

It is essential also to take the next step in the sphere of the electronic media. Without abandoning the struggle for influence on the ideological thrust of broadcasting on state radio and television channels, it would be expedient to embark immediately on the creation of a parallel system of the preparation and dissemination of audiovisual programs on the basis of the "Lenizdat" obkom publishers.

Such today are the prospects of the democratic processes of the development of the structure of the mass media, and we cannot fail to anticipate and go along with them.

In specifying the approaches to the party's restructuring and the renewal of its ideological and organizational principles we are doing so for the sake of the social and political force which has to help people halt society's increasingly steep fall into the abyss of crisis. Yes, the party is responsible for a great deal; and it is for this reason that it is duty bound, however difficult this may be, to restore the people's trust.

There are most likely many party committees and many Communists who are expecting of our conference specific guidelines as to what we need to study and how to act. This would be a return to the former type of relations in the party built on the instructions of some and the expedition of others.

Such an approach is today unacceptable. The main points of application of our forces are sufficiently clear and are reflected in the platform of Leningrad's Communists. It is essential today for everyone, our representatives in the organs of people's power included, to defend these positions, which have been collectively formulated by all Communists.

The recent period has been characterized as a time of the active politicization of our society. The multiparty system has moved from the theoretical to the practical plane. Truly, dozens of organizations laying claim to participation in the realization of power functions and expressing the interests of particular strata of the population have appeared on the political map.

There is no law governing parties as yet, but representatives of several political organizations are already at work in that same Leningrad City Soviet. How should the Communist Party organize relations with them? The times demand an urgent answer to this question. We need to frankly acknowledge that we have learned how to argue and debate.

We now need to learn to listen to one another. If this political organization or the other defends the interests of the working people not in words but in deeds, compromise in the name of these interests is not only possible, it is essential.

Not the political ambitions of individual leaders but commonsense should form the basis of the decisions adopted today.

The time when our party will for the purpose of realization of its program aims form parliamentary blocs of a socialist orientation with other political forces is evidently not all that far off, and we therefore need to learn the art of consensus today even.

Some people in our country are not averse to availing themselves of the disagreements in the party and the so-called socialistically oriented bloc to shore up their own positions. I would like to repeat once again that it is time to switch from an "either-or" to an "and-and" policy. All who are not against socialism are in the same ranks as us.

Many of us have already called attention repeatedly to the fact that the term "democratization" frequently substitutes for the word "democracy" in our party vocabulary. What is the difference here? The fact that democratization is only the process of transition to democracy. It has been proven that the law cannot be higher than the economic system and the level of culture which it has brought about.

We have, it would seem, forgotten this rule. The country, and our city also, has been engulfed in a wave of mass-meeting democracy, a wave of strikes. But holding mass meetings does not mean working. No work, no product. Is it any wonder that the consumer feels increasingly comfortless with every passing day. The times of manna from heaven are gone. On the counters today there will be only what we ourselves have cultivated, manufactured, stitched, and so forth. It is time we accustomed ourselves to this. The politicization of society, meanwhile, has led also to the fact that as a result of the ill-considered State Enterprise Act hundreds and thousands of skilled and demanding leaders, from the foreman to the general director, found themselves, as the

result of elections, cast overboard, as they say. On the one hand some of them immediately replenished the ranks of organizers of the cooperative movement, where their knowledge gained them the corresponding monetary equivalent; on the other, we quickly came to see for ourselves the decline in labor and engineering discipline, which once again led to a loss of the manufacture of output.

The party committees, which ardently supported the idea of "democratization of the management process," made their contribution to this business also. We could still try to bring the directors and other production managers and organizers back. But who will bring back the lost rate of development of production, discipline and, ultimately, the nonmanufactured products. I believe that such decisions, just like the law on combating drunkenness, should finally be deemed a political mistake, and their sponsors named.

The question of food supply is particularly serious today. We are being warned from the center about a sharp reduction in planned supplies. Deputies of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet are rightly raising the question of the need for a unification of efforts to solve the food problem, reasonably observing that in spring one day feeds a year. But their appeals are not always echoed in the Mariinskiy Palace.

It is known that to satisfy Leningraders' requirements it is essential to increase the production of milk and potatoes threefold, and of meat fivefold. For many reasons, the limited extent of the area of farmland and the shortage of labor resources not covered by the increase in the countryside's capital-to-labor ratio included, this task would seem in the foreseeable future simply impracticable.

Nonetheless, our sovkhozes [state farms]—the very foundation of our agricultural potential—have far from exhausted their possibilities. We have, for example, farms where the milk yield per cow is over 7,000 liters per year, and the potato crop amounts to 300 quintals per hectare. Not undermining this foundation to indulge fashionable trends but strengthening it—this is our main task.

The obkom needs a clear-cut agrarian policy.

The essence of it is seen to be the extended connection of the city and the oblast. This means not simply sponsorship assistance but economic mutual assistance based on mutually profitable terms and reliance on the development of the sovkhozes, which are today the main source of food supplies, and development of the individual farm and leasing contracts as an additional source of produce.

The Leningrad City Soviet and the oblast soviet have adopted good decisions on the additional construction of hothouses and vegetable and potato repositories. The situation demands an acceleration of their realization, which will make it possible to appreciably rectify the vegetable situation. The question of assistance to the sovkhozes in cultivation and harvesting on the part of industrial enterprises and establishments of the city, students, vocational-technical school trainees, and school students also needs to be resolved immediately. Now is not the time to look into why many enterprises and organizations have turned their backs on this matter.

What is important is something else: that the majority of sponsoring outfits find an opportunity to assist the sovkhozes, understanding that ultimately they are working for themselves. We cannot allow the zones of commodity vegetable- and potato-growing near Leningrad, which have been created over decades, to disappear. This would be a big mistake, which we would, in any case, have to rectify, but at far greater cost.

With the enactment of the law on land extensive opportunities have been afforded for the development of other forms of the organization of production in the countryside. These include private subsidiary plots, joint agro-industrial enterprises, and leased and peasant (individual) farms.

We have here this entire gamut of enterprises, but only in an embryonic state. The party committees are simply obliged to render people wishing to work on the land the utmost assistance, increase the efficiency of agricultural production, and make a specific contribution to the elimination of the food shortage.

No form of management can cope without technical assistance to the countryside. In the period under review, Leningrad's industrial enterprises took a very important step forward in this direction—they created a set of machines appreciably reducing expenditure of manual labor in farming and making it possible to raise the yield sharply. Because it was not possible to incorporate these machines in the state commission through the ministries and the State Planning Committee, their production and supply to the oblast's sovkhozes was thwarted. We are obliged to return once more to this matter, I believe.

The current situation as regards the supply to the population of basic foodstuffs dictates the need for a revision of the current Food Program and an acceleration of the rate of development of the agro-industrial complex. The working people of the city and the oblast expect of the organs of Soviet power the adoption of decisive measures in this direction.

Under the conditions of the current shortages an important place, whether we like it or not, is assigned the system of realization of the available commodity supply with regard for the interests of all strata of the population. We are talking about the trading organizations of the city and the oblast—the final link in the "producer-consumer" chain.

Superimposed on the inefficient management of certain workplace managers are unconcealed violations of the rules of trade and abuses of this system by certain officials.

Particularly as concerns the sale of food and industrial commodities in short supply across order desks and in mobile trade at industrial enterprises and in establishments.

Nor can we remain silent about the system introduced as of this February of the allocation of commodities in Leningrad and the oblast according to residency ID's, which has evoked an ambivalent reaction from both Leningraders and, particularly, inhabitants of adjacent oblasts.

From the economic viewpoint this action has in the past two months made it possible to reduce somewhat the removal of food from Leningrad. But what are the socioeconomic consequences of this innovation? I believe that the organs of soviet power will have to return to these matters.

A most painful social problem of Leningrad is housing.

The appreciable structural changes connected with the reorganization of the construction main administrations and the period of formation of the Leningrad Construction Committee, and the sharp outflow of manpower into the cooperative sphere, have taken a negative toll on the fulfillment of the plan quotas by the sector and realization of the "Housing 2000" program.

The lag behind the planned pace is growing, unfortunately.

There has been no appreciable increase in the capacity of the construction organizations and the housing construction works. A considerable number of them (approximately one-third) has, as before, been diverted into the erection of production facilities. Given the active participation of Leningrad's party and soviet authorities, it has for the first time been possible to exclude from the number of jobs of the Leningrad Construction Committee for 1990 approximately R70 million worth of production facilities and to channel these resources into the construction of housing and general amenities.

Despite the party organizations' repeated formulation of the question of the need for a priority increase in the capacity of the construction industry and construction materials industry resources, the Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee still lacks a clear-cut program of development of this sphere.

The enactment of the law on local self-government and the local economy is manifestly late. Attempts have been made in the region to shape several concepts of the region's transition to financial autonomy. A working group was set up last fall to formulate conceptual proposals concerning the aims, principles, and forms of the restructuring of the management and functioning of the Leningrad economy under the conditions of economic independence, self-government, and self-financing.

Undoubtedly, the regional economic mechanism should on the one hand serve the goals of a strengthening of the economic independence of Leningrad and the oblast, the increased efficiency and development of the social infrastructure, and the creation of conditions conducive to the activity of the enterprises.

On the other, it should ensure the effective specialization and cooperation of the region within the single national economic complex (or, possibly, all-Union market).

An important stage in the process of a strengthening of the region's independence is the practically complete transfer to the jurisdiction of the local soviets of questions of the development of the social sphere and satisfaction of the population's requirements in goods and services and environmental protection activity.

It is necessary under the conditions of the sharp increase in crime to display concern for a strengthening of the material-technical resources of the law enforcement authorities.

At the initiative of the obkom and gorkom the question of the state of law and order was brought up at a recent session of the Leningrad City Soviet.

Given the active participation of the enterprises, additional resources, hardware, and equipment were handed over to the internal affairs authorities.

The new obkom needs to continue the political support for this work.

The participation of all enterprises in the shaping of the revenue side of local budgets, which would make it possible to link the possibilities of the territory's social development with the growth of the efficiency of the regional economy, should be of fundamental significance.

The core and pivot of the economic mechanism, it seems to us, should be territorial planning. The new tasks are determining and cardinally changing the very approaches to it. It should not be of a consolidated, summary, but rather an enterprising, reference nature and should scientifically substantiate to a great extent the most effective ways of achieving the social and economic goals of the region's development.

And in this connection I also have to mention the following:. This is the question of the attempt scheduled for the very near future to cure our economy by the "shock therapy" method. Many Leningraders have called attention to the recent appeal of the joint obkom and gorkom plenum to the CPSU Central Committee proposing a more detailed study of the social and political consequences of the declared economic reform.

Transition to a market mechanism is worrying everyone: scientists, specialists, business managers, engineers, and workers.

Given the most favorable outcome, the triggering of the market mechanism would very quickly ensure an appreciable change and turnaround in the course of the economic reform.

However, we would have to pay an immense price for such a radical version. The possible losses cannot be ignored.

The ill-considered nature and inadequate critical study of the proposed measures could lead to the even longer stagnation of the economy and serious sociopolitical upheavals.

Primarily, given the calamitous state of the national budget, it will hardly be possible quickly to create a precise system of social support for the population. Mass unemployment, price rises, and an appreciable lowering of the living standard, given the continued differentiation of different groups of the population in terms of material provision, cannot be ruled out. It is necessary to provide for measures pertaining to the social protection of the workers of unprofitable enterprises, teachers, doctors, students, pensioners, and other fixed-income categories.

The outfits of enterprises and organizations of the defense sectors of industry would find themselves in an exceptionally difficult situation. A fundamental reorganization of the structure of production capacity is taking place in a number of instances at these enterprises in the course of implementation of the conversion plan. Even under these conditions transition to a market economy would bring the workforce to the brink of financial bankruptcy, with all the obvious consequences.

And do we have the right to waste the intellectual and production potential of the defense industry?

A great country should also have a strong combat-capable army. And this does not only mean materiel, it means primarily people—from the private to the marshal. It is well known under what difficult conditions officers serve and their families live. Intensifying this situation even more would not, I believe, be legitimate.

We are duty bound not to forget war and labor veterans and to approach their fate with all due responsibility and concern.

It should be borne in mind also that disproportions in the production structure and its noncorrespondence to the structure of demand would drive up inflation. In addition, competition, which can alone really hold back price rises, would not develop to the proper extent on account of the high degree of monopolization. It is essential to consider that, given shortages, the inflation mechanism operates in an entirely different way than it does given a balanced market. And this would strike painfully at the consumer, affording the producer an opportunity to increase his income thanks to higher prices and product-range changes without increasing production.

Under these conditions social tension could become most strong, which would create conditions for the activity of those who aspire to a restoration of the administrative-command structures in policy and the economy.

In a word, serious preparation is needed. We cannot avoid a transition period. The main thing is creating a precise system of social support for the population, which should ensure a link between the dynamics of income and prices and provide for people's adaptation to the conditions of a market economy.

We are prepared here to render the Leningrad City Soviet and the Oblast Soviet the maximum help and support. And to associate in the development and realization of these questions the entire available intellectual and information potential of the Leningrad party organization. We offer cooperation and partnership.

Listening to the report, perhaps some people will decide that the Leningrad party organization is distancing itself from the solution of the economic problems of the city and oblast. The extreme position in connection with the party's place in the economy, what is more, is that the CPSU should even now, and upon the completion of the economic reforms even more, step aside from leadership of economic processes.

I believe that this interpretation of the party's new role fails to take account of the dialectics of the relationship of the economy and policy in the actual sociopolitical situation in our country, Leningrad, and the oblast.

Under the conditions of the extraordinary economic situation which has taken shape today it would be a manifestation of political bankruptcy for the party to remove itself from participation in the solution of the complex and contradictory problems of our difficult reality. But it is not only a question of the emergency situation. It would merely exacerbate the task, leaving it even more exposed.

We are opposed to duplication in the work of the party, soviet, and state authorities, but we believe that even today a political evaluation of the economic decisions which are adopted and their social efficiency, and a political forecast of possible consequences, are essential.

But even when the economic distortions have been removed (and this is our immediate aim), after a new economic mechanism has taken shape, policy will not cease to have an immediate impact on the economy. This is an objective normality of the development of any class society. And we intend to be guided by this proposition firmly and consistently.

Deputies Discuss Work of Moscow Soviet

WA1605194590 Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 26 Apr 90 p 2

[Report on the first session of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies of the 21st Convocation by, V. Chaava: "Step by Step"]

[Text] Yesterday's work day of the first session of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies of the 21st Convocation began at the point where it left off the day before. The deputies continued to discuss the composition of the permanent commissions that have to be elected.

The question on the agenda was the commission for education, science, and the development of scientific and technical potential. However, in the very process of discussion, it somehow broke down into three independent commissions—on science and the development of scientific-technical potential; on youth affairs, and on problems of education.

Two other commissions acquired status in the debates and arguments: on legality, law and order, and citizens' rights, and on social policy. The idea of establishing a special permanent commission on military questions (one of the formulations that was developed) did not find support among the deputies; however, it was decided that, to resolve a whole number of questions about specific social groups of people, such as, for example, servicemen, workers, pensioners, and invalids, Moscow City Soviet deputy groups would be created that would examine a number of questions that are of direct concern to these social groups.

Interview During Intermission

S. Antilov, ("Democratic Russia"): I think that the session is working normally. I hope that further, especially after the intermission, when the deputies will be able to make sense out of a lot of what has been done, the work will go more smoothly. I was personally against putting the question of the election of a chairman of the Moscow City Executive Committee on the agenda of the first half of the work of the session. I believe that this question must be moved to the second half of the first session. We would be better able to take positions on candidacies, particularly during the intermission, and to make out who is who. I think that Yu.M. Luzhkov will be nominated, and, of course, a substantial part of the staff that fully understands the problems of the city should remain. But alternative elections are necessary. It is not excluded that the candidacy of Deputy N.N. Gonchar will surface in the process of discussions.

After the intermission, Deputy P. Dobrov, in addition to the already "formulated" 19 commissions, proposed the creation of one more, the 20th in number: on rules, procedures, and legal support of deputy activity. After discussions, when opinions were expressed both for and against the creation of such a commission—one of the proposals provided for temporary and not permanent status—the question was put to a vote.

And here an unforeseen hitch occurred. The fact is that 167 deputies from the number of those in the auditorium voted for the creation of the commission. It would appear that the commission was approved, but it turned out that, according to a regulation approved by the deputies, the approval of a decision requires that more than half of the elected deputies vote for it. And this figure is 232. On the other hand, under certain conditions, the regulation allows the approval of a decision by a relative majority as well. Right before the intermission in the "time limit," S. Stankevich, who was chairing the meeting, proposed that this newly formed commission analyze the data on voting procedures. An interesting paradox emerged: If the voting is invalid then the creation of the commission itself is invalid, and this means that the verdict on the competence or incompetence of the voting in its very own creation is invalid. It is for this reason that the results of the voting on the commission was recognized as invalid.

Interview During Intermission

I. Preobrazhenskiy, ("Moscow" Group): A lot of time has been spent on some sort of bloc competitions. And, nonetheless, productivity today is higher than before. In general, I think that the blocs have to be dissolved. The voting machine is working, and this interferes with the achievement of a consensus. We must remember that we are given authority, but that it has to be used wisely. Muscovites are expecting work, but at times we get bogged down in trivia. But, then, the deputy corps, without doubt, possesses high qualifications.

The last question from the previous day's agenda that the deputies succeeded in reviewing was the question of the provisional regulation concerning permanent commissions.

The objections, which were appropriate, by a part of the delegates were brought about by one of the paragraphs in Article 7 of the new regulation which prohibited leaders of commissions from holding any other positions in other organizations. This question was not conclusively resolved, and it was deferred until the second half of the session; however, the regulation itself went into effect.

At the very end of the meeting, the presidium and part of the deputies from the auditorium posed the question of attendance at meetings by the deputies. This really cannot help but put one on guard. At a minimum, a hundred, and at times even more, deputies from those already elected do not take part in the work of the session on a daily basis.

As yesterday's meeting was coming to an end, Deputy V. Doronin, on behalf of 23 colleagues, made an announcement about the formation of one more deputies group. It was given the designation "Consolidation."

This morning, after the deputies registered (there were 339 persons), the session started its work with a minute of respectful silence in memory of the victims of the Chernobyl accident that occurred exactly four years ago to the day.

During the intermission, a collection was made for the accident victims assistance fund.

Afterwards the session approved the minutes of today's meeting. It is planned to consider Article 7 of the Provisional Regulation on Permanent and Temporary Commissions of the Moscow City Soviet and to approve the composition of permanent commissions. The key question on the agenda is the election of the chairman of the Moscow City Executive Committee.

Leningrad Joint Party Conference Speeches Given

90UN1814A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 90 pp 1-5

[Speeches delivered at Joint Conference of the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU Organization]

[Excerpts]

N.N. Korablev, First Secretary of the Vasileostrovskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Party Committee]

Esteemed comrades, the report we have heard and the rayon conferences we have attended give me grounds to state that one of the decisive factors leading the party to a crisis was the prolonged retardation of the processes of transforming life within the party, mainly on the part of the Central Committee. My personal impressions from recent meetings with members of the Politburo, Comrades Gorbachev, Medvedev, Vorotnikov, and Razumovskiy, and also conversations with members of the Central Committee and observations during the course of the expanded February (1990) Plenum of the party Central Committee provide no justification for optimism about the future of the CPSU and the Soviet state. To look and not see, to listen and not hear, and to speak about the need for radical changes while at the same time torpedoing all that are really radical—such is the work style of many comrades high up in the Politburo.

All this could not but have an effect on our party's position in society. Yet it is precisely the activity of the CPSU and its leaders at various levels to which people today are linking the difficult situation that has developed in the country. The crisis in the party appeared especially in the split with Baltic Communists and the frequent confrontations of different, frequently diametrically opposed positions of CPSU members with regard to many fundamental issues and the sharp increase of resignations of members from the party.

And the most important thing is the catastrophic inability of the leaders to anticipate approaching events, to overcome developing crises on the spot, and to promptly solve crucial problems of the life of the party and society as a whole.

This is shown in their approach to problems of presidential control, Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the economic reform, and, finally, their attitude toward the Democratic Platform. It is hardly possible to count among their merits first their refusal to support various proposals and then, after a fairly short period of time, their implementation of these same proposals under their own banner.

It seems that in these cases we are dealing not only and not so much with political flexibility as with their lack of their own clearcut program of actions. Hence the contradictoriness and inconsistency in the policy of reform.

And what was the role of our oblast committee and the position of its leaders if not to overcome the crisis phenomena or at least to figure out the factors that generated the current situation. It seems to me that the decision to begin the discussions of the program of actions of the Leningrad Communists under current conditions was made too late, but also incorrectly in principle.

This made it possible to awaken many party organizations and for the first time in the country to begin serious discussions about what was bothering them. During the course of the discussions it became clear that the factors that generated the negative phenomena are not regional but exist throughout the country and throughout the party. In the foreground was the task of immediately dismantling the administrative-command system in ideology, economics, politics, and international relations and, of course, in the party above all.

Unfortunately, many radical proposals from rank-and-file communists of the city and the oblast, including those from Vasilyeostrovskiy, were not supported by leaders of the obkom and the Central Committee. At that time they were considered premature and too radical.

Incidentally, many practical but rejected proposals were subsequently included in the Democratic Platform. Many members of the oblast and city committees were unable to heed the opinion of the majority of local party organizations concerning the need to discuss the platform of the Leningrad party organization at a conference and not a combined plenum. The proposal to convene an extraordinary party conference was not supported either.

The obkom ended up between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand the rank-and-file communists, who understood that they had been deceived once again, and on the other, the leadership of the Politburo which Comrade Gidaspov managed to obey and disobey at the same time.

Since that time practically all decisions of the bureau, any personnel changes, many of which were indeed wrong, and any statements from secretaries have been perceived negatively. The image of the Leningrad Obkom and its leaders as a bulwark of conservative forces in the CPSU began to make its way through the pages of various press publications. Apparently, with the

tacit approval of the offended Politburo which in a rally was asked to account for its work.

But nobody wants to be responsible, especially personally, for what we have now.

They have also forgotten about the equality of all party members under the CPSU Regulations.

Thus our autumn burst of activity was not properly developed and ultimately the oblast and city party committees did not take the initiative.

While a lot was said about the need for an essential expansion of the rights of local party organizations, nothing was done. Fearing possible anarchy and following the established stereotypes of doing everything at the same time and only on command from the center, the Leningrad party organization lost its maneuverability in solving specific problems. At the same time our political opponents were free in their choice of actions to achieve their main goal: victory in the elections.

For many party members with initiative the possibility of realizing their potential in independent actions turned out to be extremely attractive, which led them to active participation in the work of various politicizing formations and to an active refusal to participate in implementation of the decisions of the official party organs.

In my view, the guarantee of the success of the new membership of the oblast party committee consists in its expressing the interests and opinions of communists of the Leningrad party organization and defending them without looking to higher-ups. In addition to generalizing the proposals into drafts of the party platform and rules, it should immediately begin practical implementation of the obvious measures for transferring all rights to the local party organizations even before the 28th party congress. One of the decisive elements of autonomy and independence of party organizations, in my opinion, is the changeover to their self-financing.

Taking into account the change in the status of the party in connection with the changes in Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution, it is necessary to revise the forms of relations among party organizations and the enterprises at which they are created. There is a critical question of the need to grant local organizations the right to determine their own structures, composition, and wages for party workers who have been released from the basic jobs. We considered this question at a rayon party conference and we think that each local party organization should transfer the membership fees into a running account of the rayon party organization and dispose of them. A certain percentage of deductions should be established for higher party organizations by a decision of the corresponding conferences and congresses. I suggest that the conferences consider and decide on these issues.

I also consider it necessary to bring up for discussion and approval in the second stage of the conference the centralized budget of the oblast party organization and to determine the normative deductions from the local party organizations into the accounts of the obkom and party Central Committee.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that under the new working conditions the decisions must originate from below and not be sent down from above by the higher party organs. The party obkom and raykom must become the coordinates of the activity of all party organizations, the organs that generalize the opinions of all communists and develop the corresponding resolutions. The party will have power again only when each communist knows that his voice will be heard, he will become a fighter only when he fully understands the goals and tasks of the party, when these goals become his own vital business and his conviction. But this process is lengthy and it requires a large amount of work and patience. We need a constructive dialog with each Communist, regardless of the platform on which he may stand.

V.A. Naumochkin, Machine Operator of the Repair and Operations Administration, Delegate from Vyborgskiy Rayon Party Organization

Having listened to the report of the oblast party committee I still have not heard an answer to the question of the position of the oblast committee regarding today's fundamental issues. Our conference is taking place in a difficult period. We are on the verge of changing over to market relations, or planned-market relations, as we are told. But it is clear to everyone even now that in the initial stages this will have serious negative consequences for society. And I cannot understand the position of the Leningrad Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] which in this stage supports the creation of immense monopolies, concerns, and associations of industrial enterprises.

For it is clear that monopolies of producers lead to price explosions. And we have taken monopolies to the absurd. Correspondingly, the price explosion and the increased rates of inflation are leading to a decline in the standard of living of the majority of the population. We need a mechanism for social protection of the workers. But again I did not hear anything about this in the report. Is the Leningrad Obkom working on this, does it have suggestions as to what this mechanism should be? The discussion about the idea that wages should be fixed and the incomes of the population should be indexed has been going on for a long time. Where is the guarantee that the index for increasing the incomes of the population will not lag behind the growth of prices by a year, two, or three?

All this instability and confusion in this question leads to a situation where the number of people who feel uncertain, who look with uncertainty to the future, is constantly growing.

Many people have a poor understanding or knowledge of the party line in this issue. And in our party organization there have been statements whose authors are arguing for

withdrawal from the party because at this stage they do not understand party policy and do not understand what is going on in the party. They do not understand the final goal of the party.

The second problem bothering people now is the elections. And the interaction between the party organs and the soviets. The recent campaign for elections of people's deputies of the USSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] to the local soviets showed that in this stage the center of the political struggle has shifted to the electoral districts, that is, to the place of residence of the population, to the microrayons. In order for us to confront at the proper level, what used to be called informal organizations (and now we can say that they have been formalized as political parties) in the election campaigns, we must keep a double account of communists: in their work place and in their place of residence. We must create territorial party groups and party organizations, perhaps unofficial ones, which could work to the advantage of the communist candidate who will be supported by the party organization of the given electoral district.

We must create support groups which will begin right now to collect information about the electoral districts and provide for social analysis and preparation of election programs. For now it is turning out that we have lost the elections to the Leningrad City Soviet and Oblast Soviet. We have lost without a fight, one might say. The oblast committee and the rayon committee of the party have gotten away from this issue and have not rendered the proper support to the communist candidates.

And here is the result: In an interview published yesterday in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA Deputy Rodin of the Leningrad City Soviet (393d Electoral District) stated that one-third of the deputies of the Leningrad City Soviet hold anticommunist positions and, asserting that communism means a lack of humanity, they are against the idea of communism in principle. If we do not devote attention to this problem in the future, the slogan "We are for soviets without communists," which has already been put forward, will become a reality.

Judging from the latest statements of the oblast party committee, the party Central Committee, the party organs are abandoning the leadership of the economy and direct solutions to management and economic problems and problems of replacing soviet organs. But then the question arises: How are we going to implement this strategy we are developing? Apparently we need to create all levels of factions in the CPSU. The Leningrad City Soviet is reorganizing its factions, the "Greens" and others are uniting, but nothing is heard about the Communists.

In keeping with this and the fact that we are now living under the conditions of a real multiparty system, it is necessary in the new CPSU Rules to define the rights of factions of the CPSU in soviets at all levels. They must implement party decisions, achieving the adoption of legislative decisions in the soviets. In this stage it is necessary to restructure relations between the party and the trade unions; the trade unions have ended up outside the influence of the party just as the Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] has.

I would like to express my opinion about one more issue. Before the conference began I got hold of the proposals of the party committee and Communists of the Leningrad Electrical and Technology Institute imeni V.I. Ulyanov (Lenin), which were supported by the Petrogradskiy Rayon party conference. They suggest that we exclude from the draft rules the point that says that decisions of party organs are binding for the lower organizations. It turns out that we will elect an oblast party committee and for the next five years it will have to conduct the policy which we dictate to it. The oblast party will make a decision and we in the lower organizations can decide that this decision is incorrect and refuse to carry it out or we can carry it out exactly opposite. What kind of a party will that be! It will be tens and thousands of different individual parties. In this stage each of us must take a stand. Let us still be a million, but let us be a million communists who think alike.

V.P. Zakrzhevskiy, Deputy Laboratory Chief of the "Zvezda" Association

Comrades, I would not have the audacity to present a well reasoned evaluation of the activity of the oblast and city party committees during the report period. The more so since this would pertain to the activity of the first secretary of the obkom, and I think that these nine months that have passed since his election do not provide a basis for simple evaluations.

And the accounting part of the report itself was not very long. More was said about common problems, and therefore I too shall allow myself to discuss these common problems of the party, and there are three of them which I consider fundamental.

First about the split in the CPSU. A good deal is being said and written about this today. The question is what are the reasons for this? There are many versions. For one of them I suggest turning to the draft of the new CPSU Rules where even in the preamble one has doubts about whether it is really about the Communist Party. Or if it is communist at all, then why is the idea of communism so eroded and projected onto the indefinite future? What would happen if it relied on the leading class? A wide range of numerous other problems arise—from discipline within the party to membership fees.

One might object: This is only a draft and it has to be worked out. But I wish to remind you that this document, like many others we are discussing today, originated inside the Central Committee and its numerous institutions.

When reading such documents it is sometimes very difficult to get away from the idea that they are not the fruit—as we used to like to say—of the creative development of our Marxist-Leninist legacy but the result of blatant concessions to our opponents.

And what should those who do not agree with these concessions do? This is a precondition for an ideological split.

Another example is the recent Open Letter of the Central Committee. There are various evaluations of it but basically one prevails: This letter is an untimely appeal for a purge of the ranks. This is not only my assessment but, as I understand it, that of the 48th conference of the Nevskiy Rayon CPSU organization. It is not surprising that the letter, to put it mildly, does not evoke rapture among a large number of communists.

In this connection I believe that the reasons for the developing split in the CPSU lie in the different thinking of the Democratic Platform, in the separation of the party leadership from its foundation, the local party organizations, from the rank-and-file communists. Having become unaccustomed over many years to unrestricted wielding of power by the opposition and to real political struggle, this leadership cannot withstand the ordeal of perestroyka. And for the sake of restoring its damaged authority it seems to be ready to sacrifice even its underlying principles, that is, communism, as the highest program objective and the class essence of the party.

With this kind of approach I do not think the party fully deserves the right to be called communist. And here I completely agree with the previous speaker—we must all take a clearcut stand.

Second. About democratic centralism. I am not at all against this principle. I think it is universal and logical. But at the same time it is applicable to highly organized, I would even say highly conscious parties, whose members because of their profound morality would not dare to abuse it. Unfortunately, our historical experience shows the opposite. It is as a result of the distortion of principles of democratic centralism that the command-administrative system arose, the cult, the leader worship whereby the minority controlled the majority and party comradeship was essentially replaced by military subordination. In order not to repeat these mistakes in the future, I think the principle of democratic centralism should be improved so that party committees of all levels, including the Central Committee, should be given the status of strictly executive organs that are called upon to implement the decisions we make at the congresses, conferences, and meetings, that is, those made by the higher party organs.

And the third thing. It seems to me that we are too involved in problems within the party, shoving everything else into the background. Yet the society, whose vanguard force we consider ourselves to be, is faced with problems of a much higher order—ecological, economic, interethnic, and others. I think that if yesterday the CPSU had mobilized to solve these problems, today we would have no occasion to discuss whether or not the future party would be a parliamentary type or a vanguard party.

And in conclusion I wish to emphasize that the party is in need of renewal. Even if it results in not 19 million CPSU members but fewer, here we must follow Lenin—it is better to have less but better.

In my opinion, this idea was expressed by the party gorkom secretary, Petrov, in yesterday's interview in VECHERNYY LENINGRAD when he said that new cadres are needed to renew the party. And I think that not the least of our tasks is to bring forward those communists who in word and deed will represent not their own group interests but all the interests of the whole society.

[passage omitted]

Yu.P. Arkhipov, Party Committee Secretary of the "Izhorskiy Zavod" Association, Kolpinskiy Rayon Party Organization

Comrade communists! The combined report-election conference of Leningrad communists, which is taking place at this turning point in the fate of the country and the society, should in my view provide answers to the most fundamental questions: Is the Leningrad party organization unified in its basic directions of political and economic reform and is it capable of carrying them out effectively?

By political reform we basically mean changing the political structure of the society. We have in mind presidential power, a multiparty system, a change in the role and position of the sociopolitical organization in the society, and so forth. And the economic reform can be seen more and more clearly in the transition to a market economy along with the necessary regulation on the part of the society.

I should like to devote my speech not so much to the achievements and future transformations, as was done in the report, as to an analysis of the mistakes made by the obkom and gorkom [city party committee] during their past year of work. Why during the year? Because it was in March of last year, after the failure of the Leningrad leadership at the elections, that the end came to the period of political comfort and a completely new period began, not only one of diversity of opinions but also a period of more active work on the part of Leningraders to defend their ideas and views in the political struggle. At the same time the city party organization began more actively to manifest crisis phenomena.

This is why an analysis of the activity of the obkom during the report period should be a concrete lesson and a mandate for the new obkom which has just about already been elected. I shall say frankly that it is a unique

case. We have never before had an instance where the party obkom was already elected when the report was being given.

The first perceptible crack among the city's communists was formed during the elections of USSR people's deputies. The fact that party and soviet leaders of the city failed to be elected as deputies drew the attention not only of the whole country but also of other countries of the world to us. Let us say frankly that the events were unusual. And it was no accident that many of the suggestions from city communists were to hold a party conference immediately so they could dot all the "i's" there. And it was decided to try to consolidate the party organization through an analysis of the factors. But, alas! The leadership of the party obkom and gorkom did not do this but, rather, made a decision to hold joint plenums directed, as it turned out later, toward welding themselves together. The subsequent course of events showed that there was no great need for this since the joint plenums adopted almost all of their decisions almost unanimously.

This apparently also increased the vigilance of the party leaders and did not enable them to develop the correct position in time. Thus during the period of rapid formation of such social organizations and movements in Leningrad as the United Workers Front, the People's Front, Otechestvo, Democratic Union, and others, the obkom leadership took a course not toward constructive dialog with them but, on the contrary, their sympathies were more for organizations of the United Workers Front type, about which one can draw a conclusion from the report of Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov to a number of obkom and gorkom plenums last year.

And the logical continuation of this approach was the recent recognition of the actual existence of a new party within the party of communists—the RKP [Russian Communist Party]. All this was done by 32 delegates to the congress with the tacit agreement of the secretaries of the party obkom and with the support of the united plenum of the party obkom and gorkom.

Well, everyone is well aware of the conservative programs they have suggested and are suggesting to Leningraders. That is, today this conclusion is presenting itself: By first relying not on consolidation with the new forces but on confrontation through other almost artificial social and political organizations, the obkom made a strategic error which led to a situation where Leningrad, a city of three revolutions, became the testing ground for working out the battle between conservative and democratic forces.

Typically, they all achieved a certain amount of success. Although each achieved it in his own environment: The democrats are winning among the voters and the conservatives are the most popular among the party leaders of various party organizations in the city.

Actually, nobody in the city is looking for paths to consolidation although demands for this are being heard from the local party organizations. Both sides are more interested in finding differences than things in common so as to cooperate. The escalation of tension among them is increasing rather than decreasing, and the situation is similar to that of the first years after the revolution when neither group (I have in mind the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks) would make any concessions or compromises. Everyone is well aware of how all this ended—in civil war.

Not to allow a repetition of the mistakes is the main task of the newly elected obkom. It seems to me that we have more in common than we have reasons for breaking apart. The example of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria shows that when there are differences of opinion it is impossible to get by without dialog at the roundtable, and there are more than enough common subjects: the economy, urban ecology, the production of food products, the housing program, conversion of defense industry enterprises, and so forth. Then there will be no basis for some people's desires to get ahead of others and to things semilegally and in a terrible hurry and create such organizations as the United Workers Front and the RKP—this will enable us to get away from politicking and political games and move on to real politics, and then there will be no need for competition between the conservative part of the CPSU Central Committee and the communists of the city. Then the behavior of the secretariat, especially of the first secretary of the obkom, will be more consistent than what we see now. Then the party leaders will replace the struggle for group interests and elite forms of work with work among the masses and will really begin to express their interests.

But for now we have just the opposite. It was this circumstance that forced the conservative wing in the party to hold the constituent congress of the RKP in Leningrad. This explains the ideological unity of the United Workers Front and Yedinstvo. And it is the confidence of the conservative part of the Central Committee in the idea that Leningrad party leaders would support the idea of creating the RKP in Leningrad that led to the appearance of the program to return the party to the real Stalinist times.

Leningraders are waiting for answers to these questions and it is a great pity that they have not had them before. It is here, at the conference, that we should clearly figure out the interests of the party elite and those of the rank-and-file communists. Delay in holding the conference gave our party organization time to assume clear conservative features and it is easy for politicians to take advantage of them, which, in turn, even further separates the Leningraders who are nonparty members from communists, communists from their leaders, and the obkom from the Leningrad Soviet. This is quite inadmissible in the present political situation.

A couple of words about the economy. For Leningrad this is a more difficult problem than politics because for many years it was mainly science-intensive industry,

mainly of a defense profile, that was concentrated in the city, this is where the fixed capital was invested, and success here was apparent. Less was invested in the basic branches and light industry enterprises, and when a course was taken toward a peacetime economy, all these omissions were clearly apparent. It turns out that conversion was not a gift for the collectives of defense enterprises and here apparently is where one finds the main reason for the tension in them. It is here that one hears most frequently the appeals to turn back the clock to 1985. It would be possible to rectify the situation with good work on the part of light and the food industry, but there is no less social tension there because much has gone into decline.

Apparently it is time for the city's communists and their deputies to shift from "political chattering," to use Lenin's term, to concrete practical actions, for the changeover to market relations will aggravate the already existing problems, and it is not difficult to predict the consequences of that. But we would like communists to not only frighten themselves and others with the possible consequences of changing over to the market, but to engage in constructive work to develop effective mechanisms that increase man's social protection and become involved in educating people about the market form of organization of the economy, for the majority of us simply do not know what it is, and those who did know forgot a long time go. And now we should be guided not by fear but by reason, and reason requires knowledge.

In concluding my speech I should like to emphasize once again that just as economic and politics are closely interwoven, so the efforts of Leningraders should be closely united to surmount economic and political crises. And the city party organization can set the tone in this. And when selecting a leader of Leningrad communists today, we must be well aware of the responsibility placed on all of us since it is now something we have in common and, taking into account what has been said, this is something for every Communist at the conference to think about.

[passage omitted]

V.I. Kireyev, First Secretary of the Leninskiy CPSU Raykom

Esteemed Comrade Deputies!

Before beginning my speech I would like to quote a couple of words of the renowned American economist Vasiliy Vasilyevich Leontieff. When he was asked what we should do first in order for perestroyka to proceed in a channel which would really be to the benefit of our people, he said: You should have fed and clothed the people and after that you could worry about democracy.

Well, since we began with democracy, let us evaluate the situation that has developed here. Two years ago, on 23 April, it was exactly five years since the day of the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. And what do we have today? Everyone has been filled with the euphoria of populism on the soil of democracy and glasnost, and the slogan we Communists proclaimed, "The party has begun perestroyka," except for rejection, evokes nothing but bitterness. Since the party—or to be more precise, its leadership at the level of the Central Committee—having proclaimed perestroyka, itself ended up unprepared to conduct the reform and it did not anticipate the negative tendency in the development of the economy, the social sphere, interethnic relations, and the spiritual life of the society. And they forgot that all the phenomena and reforms that are taking place affect not only the leadership of the party and country, not only the 19 million communists, but also all the Soviet people.

The previous negative stereotypes did not make us wait long and the "new style" proposed from above was immediately seen for what it was by the lower units of the party structure. And, painful as it is to say so, this style is also inherent in the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU Committees. Our elective organs are not consistent enough in their actions, they are not rational in evaluating the political situation and determining the optimal structures and tactical steps in participating in the political life of the city and finding points of contact with informal associations which enjoy a great deal of authority among the population. In this situation we must be more radical than the radicals and we must take all reasonable suggestions as our own. Opponents of this viewpoint usually warn that this could lead us far from the "principles" with which you are all familiar. But within certain limits, beyond which, regardless of what the sides may wish, a split is inevitable, which will lead to the creation of a different party.

When steps were taken after the election of the new members of the city and oblast party committees one could still see attempts to enlist members of the elective organ and secretaries of large local party organizations in the work. But after the events in March 1989 these attempts were reduced to nil. It was mainly the leaders of the higher party organizations and the apparatus—as has been said here, the not altogether controlled apparatus—that engaged in politics. One could become convinced of this at a meeting which took place recently with a member of the Politburo, the secretary of the Central Committee, Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev.

This style was especially clearly established by the events that preceded our conference, from December through March, at the level of the Central Committee and the oblast party committee.

April. The latest event was the Open Letter of the Central Committee to Communists of the country and the discussion of it the next day at the joint plenum of the obkom and city party committee, whose decisions stunned many people since in his speech Comrade Fateyev, the secretary of the oblast party committee, proposed a program of action for the Leningrad party committee based only on the just-published Open Letter

of the CPSU Central Committee. Speaking out of principle, it would make sense to discuss this question again. With whom should one part ways after the adoption of the decision of the gorkom and raykom with a six-vote margin—that is the question. I think we should probably part ways with those who prepared the draft of the decree without taking into account the opinions of the local party organizations. (Applause).

This style has been exhibited not only at the last plenum but also at preceding ones which are held almost every month. Here attempts have been made to express the opinions of the local party organizations (for example, questions of the extraordinary conference of the Leningrad party organization, the convocation of an extraordinary congress after the referendums in Leninskiy and Frunzenskiy rayons, and the decisions of the plenum of the Vasileostrovskiy CPSU Raykom), but the opinions of these rayon party organizations were not discussed and the decision did not conform to the results of the voting. Moreover, certain proposals, even ones on which they voted, were not included in the decree. One of them was to create a working group on privileges, for which the party workers are constantly being criticized. Nothing has changed.

There has also been inconsistency in the actions of the first secretary of the oblast party committee, Comrade Gidaspov. This was discussed in the speech by Comrade Korablev. In my view, one of the largest mistakes was the inconsistency in the implementation of the personnel policy. Having become first secretary, Boris Veniaminovich gave his assurances that personnel changes would be made. They occurred, but not at the management level, which was reflected in the activity of the Leningrad party organization.

So is there a crisis in the party? Yes. This is the opinion of the rayon conference we held on 6 April. The crisis is manifested in the ideological and practical inconsistency of the model of socialism that is being realized, the growing political mistrust in the party, and the aggravated contradiction between leadership organs and lower party organizations. The political struggle for economic and ideological dominance has become a reality. This demand of the times places fundamentally new requirements on communists. Under these conditions the party has been unable to reinterpret its ideological doctrines, coordinate them with the interests of the modern society, and rearrange its own organizational structure.

The most positive direction which is capable of uniting the majority of parties was expressed in the platform of the Central Committee and the Democratic Platform as well as the draft of the new CPSU Rules. If they were critically interpreted and worked on further they could become the platform for a renewed party. But it must be rid of its imprecision of objectives and the eroded ideological principles that are inherent in the Central Committee platform, and also the organizational vagueness and a certain rally- like quality in the Democratic Platform.

Refraining from a dogmatic interpretation of Marxism and ideological stereotypes that have not withstood the test of time, we must reach a new interpretation of the functions of the radical rearrangement of the structure and methods of party work. The power of the party masses should be realized in the party. Above all through the independence of the local party organizations and responsibility for the decisions that are made. While avoiding confrontation and national-religious intolerance, it is important to reach the objectives that have been set on the basis of constructive dialogue and a search for mutual understanding with all political forces that are operating within the framework of the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws. The renewed CPSU should express the interests of the working man and unite his active supporters.

We see the problem of youth as one of the most important issues in the concept of democratic transformations in the CPSU. A party whose ideology does not reflect the interests of youth and does not enjoy their support is historically doomed. The party should have an active youth policy and program.

We see a practical way out of the crisis in the creation of a renewed CPSU and republic organization of the RSFSR as a part of it. The 28th CPSU Congress, convened at this crucial moment of perestroyka, should unite the leading democratic forces in the society. The 35th conference of the Leninskiy Rayon organization of the CPSU declares the need for radical democratic transformations in the party and appeals to the 28th CPSU Congress to use the drafts of two programs in working out program documents: the "Toward a Humane Democratic Socialism" of the CPSU Central Committee and the Democratic Platform of the CPSU.

I call on the delegates of the combined oblast and city conference to support the appeal to the congress and to adopt at the conference the resolution I just read to you.

[passage omitted]

V.V. Kalashnikov, Dean, Department Head, Leningrad Electrical Technology Institute, Petrogradskiy Rayon Party Organization

When discussing the results of and prospects for our work we cannot bypass the question of the main source of our problems, our troubles, and the crisis in the party. I support those who see this source as the prevalence of the command-administrative system of party management. The fate of the party and the fate of the Leningrad party organization depend on whether or not this system is destroyed during the work of the 28th congress. And the results of the work of the congress depend to a significant degree on the preparations for this congress and the mandates with which we send delegates to the congress in May. The Leningrad party organization has immense authority and is capable of exerting significant influence on the preparations for the 28th congress. I consider this to be our major task today. June will be too late to deal with it.

On behalf of the delegates of Petrogradskiy Rayon and on behalf of the group of delegates of VUZ's [higher educational institutions] of the city, I ask the conference to support our position concerning principal points of the rules and have the entire party adopt it. I do not suggest discussing the rules, I suggest supporting our position, the position of the Vasileostrovskiy residents and similar positions of all other communists who pursue the same goal: To destroy the administrative-command system of party management. And we suggest destroying its four main bastions.

The first of these bastions is the idea that decisions of the higher organs are binding for the lower organs. In the draft of the rules proposed by the Central Committee this point is made into an absolute. According to Point 31, the Presidium of the Central Committee, that is, actually the executive organ of the Central Committee, sends decisions to be executed by the party organizations on its behalf. This directly contradicts the thesis about self- management in the party and the power of the party masses. Therefore we suggest eliminating the point according to which decisions of party organs are binding for party organizations. This is a rejection not of democratic centralism but of bureaucratic centralism! We suggest including a point whereby decisions of party forums (meetings, conferences, congresses) are binding for the organizations represented at them. We suggest including in the rules a point to the effect that the task of party organs is to work to coordinate and organize the implementation of decisions made at the forums. All decisions made by party organs during this work are presented to the lower organizations as recommendations whose fulfillment the party organ achieves through persuasion rather than by an order. The guarantee of the effectiveness of this mechanism is the actual authority of the party organ.

The second bastion of the administrative-command system is the multi-stage, nondemocratic system of elections. It makes it possible to weed out unsuitable candidates and elect to party organs communists who have not been given support from local organizations. In order to destroy this bastion, we suggest: holding direct elections of members of party organs up to the level of the party obkom. Three-fourths of the members of the Central Committee should be chosen at oblast conferences according to quotas determined by the number of members of the organization. One-fourth of the Central Committee members should be elected directly at the congress. This will make it possible to put an end to the practice whereby the old secretariat of the Central Committee, when preparing for the congress, actually forms the new Central Committee by proposing that the delegates vote for candidates they do not know. Moreover, the practice of electing Central Committee members at the congress makes them independent of the local organizations since a delegate elected at the congress cannot be recalled by a decision of the oblast organization. We suggest including in the rules a point to the effect that all secretaries must be elected at conferences and not just first secretaries. This measure is not only more democratic from the standpoint of the formation of the secretariat but it provides for a greater degree of collegiality in its work since it increases the degree of independence of all members of the secretariat in relation to the first secretary.

The third bastion of the administrative-command system is the monopoly of the party organs over the party press. In order to eliminate the monopoly we suggest transforming press publications from organs of committees into organs of organizations. The editors-in-chief would be elected by a party forum. A point should be included to the effect that the central party organs must within 10 days publish the statements and platforms of the party organizations at the oblast level, and the local press—the corresponding documents of the local organizations.

The fourth bastion of the administrative-command system is the center's monopoly on the party coffers. In order to eliminate this monopoly we suggest giving the local organizations the right to keep no less than 50 percent of the party dues at their disposal and to transfer the rest of the funds to the raykom, gorkom, or obkom. The procedure for spending this money should be established at the corresponding conferences on the basis of budgets that are submitted. The activity of the Central Committee would be financed with part of the income from the central party press and the rest of it would be used to support the local party organizations in need of financial aid. We suggest setting the amount of party dues from the workers at the level of one percent of the real net income after all kinds of taxes.

Obviously, these proposals could be significantly refined and augmented.

But it would be a mistake to use this as a pretext for refusing to form a principled position regarding our proposals and to inform communists of the country about them. If other rayon organizations of Leningrad and the oblast have prepared packages of proposals that are harmonious with these, we are prepared to support them. The main thing today is not to adopt the final package but to exert a fundamental influence on the course of the discussion of the rules in all oblast organizations of the country. I introduce the following proposals into the draft of the resolution regarding this issue.

First: Approve the proposals of communists from Petrogradskiy and Vasileostrovskiy Rayons as a basis for further discussion of rules questions. Second: Instruct the obkom to inform other party organizations at the oblast level of the position of Leningrad communists. Third: Create a working group to prepare a final package of proposals for the CPSU Rules so that this package can be considered and approved during the work of the second stage of this conference.

Yes, comrades, in my opinion, none of the people who have spoken before me have given a straightforward and

frank evaluation of the work of the party obkom. They have all somehow expressed their own dissatisfaction with one or another aspect of the work of the party obkom, but I have not heard an evaluation. And I do not have the right to give one on behalf of the entire Petrogradskiy Rayon organization. We did not vote for an evaluation. The delegates from the rayon did not give me this authority. But the party meeting of the Leningrad Electrical Technology Institute at least twice adopted a resolution concerning the unsatisfactory work of the party obkom. On behalf of myself personally, I suggest declaring the work of the party obkom to be unsatisfactory. (Applause).

V.Ya. Oskotskiy, Lead Engineer of the Leningrad Scientific Research Radio Technological Institute, Dzerzhinskiy Rayon Party Organization

The picture painted in the first part of Boris Veniaminovich's report was somewhat gloomy. It seemed that suddenly we actually admitted that we were in a crisis—something about which we frequently do not speak. But subsequently the report rectified this picture. It turned out that in general corrupt bureaucrats are to blame, the Central Committee is to blame... That is, the blame lies with someone somewhere outside of Leningrad. This focus was used again.

But I think a large part of the blame lies with the leadership of the Leningrad party organization. I must say that the communists insisted on convening this conference as an extraordinary one. That is, a conference convened because a large number of communists had expressed their lack of confidence in the party obkom. But when we express this lack of confidence in the party obkom in our resolutions I would like very much for these words to penetrate. To get through as they should.

Today we might be surprised by the appeals coming from the central organs and we might be surprised by the incompetence of people in the Central Committee. We are now recalling Medvedev who came here, but there was no discussion. And all this, in my view, happens because between our local party organizations or, as people now say, the "rank-and-file communists" and, again as people now say, the "higher organs," there is a whole group of people who are apparently carrying out their duties and probably earning their pay.

The fact is that the proposals heard from the podium are contained in letters and the perturbation of the rank-and-file communists—all this is being transformed into draft decisions, draft decrees which contain nothing of the kind. It is offensive that after I spoke at the rayon conference and made suggestions, I did not see a single one of them later in the decree that was read.

The majority at the podium of our rayon conference were representatives of the Democratic Platform. Perhaps I am deluded or exaggerating but about 50 percent of them had feasible proposals. But the decree used the CPSU Central Committee Platform as a basis. And there was not a word about the fact that it is necessary to use the Democratic Platform in the materials for the 28th Congress.

We think the decrees coming out of our organizations should reach the higher organizations, including the Central Committee. Only then will it be understood how our party lives. But today this is not happening. And I think the phrase "so-called democratic platform"—in particular, we heard this from Boris Veniaminovich today—has already become a catch phrase like "and the Shepilov's who joined them." We still must really learn to listen and understand and not attach labels.

The Democratic Platform has been made public. It contains nothing anti-Leninist for which people could be expelled from the party. It is completely logical. And they should have made maximum use of it in the documents for the 28th congress. As concerns the party rules—there is a battle with an imaginary enemy here. We are discussing drafts of the rules while the only draft that has been published is that proposed by the CPSU Central Committee. We have seen no alternate drafts of the party rules in the press. But at the same time they do exist. In particular several variants have been developed by communists who support the Democratic Platform.

The comrade who spoke before me mentioned the four bastions that must be broken in order to lead the party to renewal and to democratization. We fully agree with him. The most fundamental bastion is our party's structure. Today it has been turned completely upside down. We have, I repeat, "higher" and "lower" organs. But there should only be "higher" organs—the meetings of the local organizations, conferences, and congresses. All the so-called "higher" organs should be executive committees. Executive committees of the corresponding meetings, conferences, and congresses. And they should express only their will.

Here it is suggested that these same management organs—I have in mind the meetings, conferences, and congresses—be changed into permanent ones. Only then will it be possible to turn things right side up. Then the decisions will be democratic. These management organs (meetings, congresses, conferences) should have mandates for three or five years. This should be written in the rules.

This is the only way to solve many problems, including those that are suddenly arising today around "democratic centralism." You understand, they can accuse us again, but all those abuses we have committed and the deviations from the norms of democracy certainly did not derive from the term itself. In and of itself there is nothing terrible about it. The most terrible thing is that it is linked to the structure that exists in the party today.

And another thing. In any democratic state the rights of the minority must be protected. Today's democratic centralism does not envision this. In today's draft of the Rules of the CPSU Central Committee, which is actually no different from the one we had before, the same

democratic centralism has been scattered among the sections. We found five references to it. The minority should have the right to speak and defend its positions before and after the adoption of a decision. The minority should have the opportunity to unite so that its positions can be transformed into the position of the majority. Remember that the minority is most frequently the creative party. If we lose minority opinion we practically lose the development of the party.

I will conclude. I will turn the decisions and decrees being adopted by the rank-and-file party members over to the editorial commission. I think it will use these materials when preparing the documents for the 28th party congress.

Speaking of the work of our party obkom, I share the mistrust of it we have already expressed and think we should rate its work as unsatisfactory.

[passage omitted]

V.N. Vasilyev, Party Committee Secretary of the Rubin Special Design Bureau for Maritime Technology, Frunzenskiy Rayon

Esteemed Comrades!

I think that any speaker at the conference today must first of all convey the opinion of the communists who chose him as a delegate to this conference. To this I must also add the instructions from the majority of delegates of the Frunzenskiy Rayon party organization and therefore in my speech I might possibly repeat what has been said before me.

In our opinion, the style of the work of the oblast committee has improved little. The basic work with the local party organizations and the preparation of the decision of the oblast committee were done by the party apparatus as usual, and the elective organ participated little in this work. The lessons of the 1989 elections were apparently in vain, and the main priority task of the party—the selection of candidates for the soviets—and the assistance to them during the election campaign was organized poorly.

Practically every communist candidate not supported by the People's Front or the "Democratic Elections-90" fought alone or with the help of his support group. It was as though we did not have a powerful structure, connections, and party workers who had been relieved of their main duties and who were supposed to have coordinated this work and organized all the assistance for the campaign. Instead of this, many workers of the party apparatus in the party oblast committee and rayon committees decided to run for the deputy seats themselves. Everyone knows the results of this, and the large amount of work done a year ago to explain how communists are assigned to the territories of the city went to waste.

What I would call "interesting" relations have developed between our oblast committee and the party Central Committee. A typical example: the appeal to the Central Committee from the last joint plenum. Let me refresh your memory: Ask the CPSU Central Committee to take a stand on the question of the possible social consequences of changing the country's economy over to market relations and the political responsibility for the outcome of this decision. Up to now I personally have thought that there were only two paths. The first: To support and implement the policy of the higher party organs. The second: Not to support it, to criticize it, and to defend one's own viewpoint. But it turns out that there is also a third path: Simply ask to take the responsibility on yourself.

Let us assume that tomorrow we receive this answer: "severe social consequences are expected and Politburo members Gorbachev and Ryzhkov will take responsibility for them." What will we do next in this situation? If we think about this seriously I think we scholars of Leningrad are more than capable of evaluating these consequences for ourselves. And it is time for all party members to recognize and bear the responsibility for the policy of the Central Committee.

Another question: Will we be able to influence this policy? I think we will be able to if in our work we rely on the opinion of the majority of communists of the entire party organization. But so far the oblast committee has not asked the opinion of the rank-and-file communists on such a large scale—particularly concerning the proposed changes in the economy. True, I myself have not yet suggested other ways out of the crisis either. As concerns responsibility for the concrete decision of the government, I think the USSR people's deputies in attendance here will suggest that the concrete responsibility today is born by the president, the parliament, and the USSR people's deputies—probably in that order.

It was gratifying, of course, to note that a referendum was held in our oblast party organization. But the question of our attitude toward the creation of the Russian Communist Party was clearly posed incorrectly. In our view, this did not make it possible for the majority of communists to completely figure out what was happening. The majority of communists in Frunzenskiy Rayon came out in support of the creation of a Russian party organization, but as a part of the CPSU and with the same program. We do not support the program proposed by the initiative committee for the creation of the RKP, we are against a split, and we consider it necessary, before the 28th CPSU Congress, to convey all constructive suggestions, regardless of the platforms from which they came.

And today we would like to hear Boris Veniaminovich's explanations, which were not clear from his report: Why when adopting at the last plenum the resolution "to resolve in principle the issue of membership in the CPSU of leaders of faction formations," did the oblast committee give practically no evaluation of the preparations for the constituent congress of the RKP or influence the way it was conducted? After all, the RKP congress envisions the formation of factions.

I wish to add that recently there was a conference in Moscow, in the bureau of the Central Committee for the Russian party organization, whose participants included Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov, Viktor Arkadyevich Tyulkin, and the secretary of the "Avangarda" party committee, who represented the local party organizations. Viktor Arkadyevich is on the initiative committee for preparing for the RKP constituent congress, and I personally have a great deal of respect for him and his positions although I do not share them. But, in my opinion, one should still have representatives at such forums, at least one if not several who reflect the entire range of opinions of the Leningrad party organization. Does Viktor Arkadyevich alone express them? I personally am not sure he does.

As concerns the faction formations of proponents of the Democratic Platform, the attitude of the rayon's communists toward this is exactly the same.

Today organizational dissension within the party is distracting communists from their work in the collectives, and it does not add to our authority. We do not think that the platform adopted at the November Plenum was a complete basis for the practical actions of our oblast committee. One example. We all have in our hands the first issue of VESTNIK OBLASTNOGO I GORODSKOGO KOMITETA PARTII [Oblast and City Party Committee Herald]. But if we look at this first issue and read the platform, it is written there that it is necessary to prepare and publish the VESTNIK LENINGRADSKOY PARTIYNOY ORGANIZATSII [Leningrad Party Organization Herald]. They are probably not the same thing.

And in conclusion I would like to support the statement of representatives of the oblast: With the inertia of our economic machine no kind of "shock therapy" will produce an immediate result, but the consequences of the decline in the deliveries of agricultural products will quickly make us forget about all party discussions. And the question of aid to the sovkhozes [state farms] can by no means be removed from the agenda today. Perhaps the speech of one of the raykom secretaries did not come through very clearly but I think he interpreted the essence correctly.

And the last thing. On behalf of our delegation we are suggesting that all secretaries of the oblast committee be elected at the conference. The question of evaluating the work of the oblast committee was discussed by our delegation and this is the way it sounded: The evaluation is unsatisfactory, but it is not a sharp denouncement.

[passage omitted]

P.A. Manotskov, Director of School No. 410, Pushkinskiy Rayon

Esteemed Comrades!

As you have already heard, I am the director of a school. I have been the school's director for a year but I have been a teacher for 20. Therefore, believe me, I am well aware of the incredibly grave ills of our public education, and, in my opinion, it might be that this subject deserves to be the main one at one of the next forums of Leningrad communists. And we are not alone in this.

But I risk arousing the dissatisfaction and perhaps even the anger of my colleague teachers since I want to use my appearance at this podium to discuss something other than the defects of Soviet schools. It is my profound conviction that these defects were brought about by deeper causes, diseases of our economic and political systems. Even stronger light was shed on this disease by the present political situation in the party which is linked to the clash of platforms and the Letter of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Letter of the CPSU Central Committee, on the one hand, made me extremely bitter and, on the other hand, it did not surprise me at all. Nor did anything that followed it. I was simply convinced once again that I was right to evaluate the draft Platform of the Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress as a document that was not only vague (which is also admitted by the majority of proponents of this platform) but also internally contradictory. While proclaiming principles of democratic socialism, wide-reaching democracy within the party, and so forth, the platform—and the draft rules along with it—at the same time presume a rejection of proclaimed democracy. This rejection is presumed in the platform and is quite unequivocally proclaimed in the speeches at the Central Committee plenum (especially indicative was the February Plenum which condemned this platform) and in the speeches of M.S. Gorbachev both at the plenums and before the delegates of the "remarkable" Komsomol congress, and also in the speech of Comrade Gidaspov at this same February Plenum.

In essence, having different ideas in the party is categorically rejected. And the logic of the considerations is purely Stalinist. Here are some examples of this logic: The Democratic Platform rejects Marxism-Leninism, which means socialism (and our accomplishments along this path), which means that it is against the people. The Democratic Platform rejects the principle of democratic centralism which means it is in favor of anarchy which means it is in favor of destroying the party. The Democratic Platform promotes the idea of a parliamentary party, which means it is in favor of abandoning its vanguard role and in favor of factions. Which means, again, that it is in favor of anarchy and destruction. And if the Democratic Platform is against socialism, the party, and the people—what do they want, whom are they for? And, very simply, they want capitalism, they espouse the interests of the shadow economy, they cherish their own ambitions, and they are lusting for power.

That is it, the "image of the enemy" has been fashioned, and it is now a matter of a command. And the Letter was such a command. We have already been taught to take

such a document as a directive, as a guide to action. Psychologically, the Letter of the Central Committee has already started to work. Very many people, without going into the essence of the Democratic Platform, for there has not yet been any discussion of it, are already internally rejecting it.

From various podiums people are already thundering about dissenting "renegades" and this word is being used at the most diverse levels. Criteria are already being developed for separating the "scapegoats" from the "sacrificial lambs" and in places throughout the country they have already started to expel them from the party. As it turns out, this awaited us as well. I would like very much to hear more specifically what kind of a resolution was proposed to the delegates of the last combined Leningrad plenum. According to certain rumors there was a draft resolution which envisioned quite specific organizational measures regarding proponents of the Democratic Platform. I would like very much to hear something more precise about this.

I am far from convinced, I emphasize, of the correctness of a number of provisions of the Democratic Platform. There is much that still has to be thought through and weighed. But there is one thing of which I am absolutely convinced—and I do not think I am alone in this—and that is the incorrectness of a number of fundamental points of the Central Committee Platform.

First: the unshakability of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. I think—and I am not alone here—that what this concept denotes today is actually a continuation of the approach to this concept of at least the last 50 years, that is, Stalinism.

Second: the unshakability of the principles of socialism. What kind? Even with all that is said about this subject in the Central Committee Platform it is not clear what they have in mind. And judging from the more than tolerant attitude toward the ideology of proponents of the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" (I have in mind the United Workers Front and the already fairly seriously formulated tenets and resolutions of the RKP), we are again speaking about Stalinist socialism.

Third: democratic centralism. All the history of adhering to this principle shows that it has never been accompanied by democracy. And it is not that we are not civilized enough. It is that generally throughout our history this democratic centralism has been manifested in only one way: subordination of lower to higher, that is, the majority to the minority! The rejection of centralism does not destroy the party; it destroys the power of the apparatus over the party. Throughout the world there are a multitude of parties operating according to principles of both pluralism and democratic unity and allowing dissenters and factions in their ranks. And they are operating successfully. And what successes has our centralism brought us?

Our "successes" are obvious—they are coming apart at all the seams. I am also convinced that regardless of the Democratic Platform, whether it influences party policy or not (and it is quite possible even to eliminate it from the party; unlike the preceding speaker, incidentally, I think the party only stands to lose from this), nonetheless, independently of it, the party will have to—life demands this—adopt parliamentarianism and reject centralism. Just as it accepted the idea of a market economy, rejected Article 6, and so forth.

True, the party was clearly late in recognizing these issues. And I think that today the party—and this should be reflected in our conference's decision—should direct all its efforts toward publicity. For the party is above all an educational, educating institution. It must promote an obvious idea: If we retain our previous positions the country and the party are doomed to complete failure.

We have no alternative, for example, to a market economy. And if now, at today's level of self-awareness, we go to the people with a proposal for a referendum "for" or "against" a market economy, the people will be "against" it, the more so since they are so frightened of it. And the fear is partially justified, but there are no explanations of the need for it. This is where the party's major efforts should be directed. If we do not take this path, it will be possible to avoid a complete collapse only on the path of a dictatorship, to which, actually, the RKP is calling us. But I do not think this will suit either the people or us.

As concerns the evaluation of the activity of the oblast party committee and its secretariat—this is again my viewpoint because this question was not discussed by our delegation—I think that the evaluation must be unsatisfactory. [passage omitted]

Prokofyev Comments on Moscow Party Congress

90UN1779A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 p 3

[Report on interview with First Secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee Yuriy Prokofyev by MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent V. Yevseyev; date and place not given: "April Moscow. On the Eve of Expected Changes"]

[Text] **Perhaps, some people will not agree with this, but we still think that the word "anticipation" is the most precise definition of political climate in these parts at present. In the mail we receive from our readers, this anticipation shines through mistrust and irritation, through fatigue and even fear. There is anticipation, despite the increasingly barren shops, despite the uneasy, tense atmosphere prevailing in our society. Yet, there is anticipation, anticipation of justice and prosperity. Some people look to the party congress which is being prepared for forthcoming favorable changes; others attach hopes to the legislative activities of the parliament; yet others look intently at the appearance of the new Moscow Soviet with an advance dose of optimism... It is hard to say, but this may be the last credit of trust extended to those on whom the future of the people, the country, and the city**

depends... We may also read this in the letters to MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA on which today's interview is based.

From Which Platform Will the Train Leave?

[Yevseyev] Muscovites and readers of our newspaper from other cities touch with increasing vigor on recent topical issues and events many of which are associated with the party crisis—this word is used in almost one out of two letters on this topic. For example, here is what engineer L. Mironyuk from Khabarovsk writes: "Amending Article 6 of the Constitution has by no means solved all problems. The CPSU still remains the most influential force of our society, a crisis in its ranks one way or another affects the life of the entire country, and continues to keep all of us on edge. This is why we await the 28th congress of the Communists so intently. A lot is going to hinge on its outcome, and one cannot fail to understand this. Likewise, we cannot fail to understand that a lot depends on the position and actions of the Moscow party organization. After all, it is no secret that many organizations of the country continue to emulate its behavior. Do the Communists of Moscow realize it, do they appreciate their responsibility?"

[Prokofyev] The Moscow city party organization has always been in a class by itself. This is understandable. It is also understandable that its actions were and are followed with particular attention. However, I would not like to go back to the time when the Moscow gorkom [city party committee] was the first "to respond" to certain events, and virtually every step taken by Moscow Communists was equivalent to an unofficial instruction: "Do what I do!"

At present, every party organization should determine its position and actions without deferring to anyone at all. Only in this case will we arrive at the 28th congress of the party with an honest, thoroughly thought through, and clear understanding of the situation which has emerged in the party and its role under new conditions.

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, how are preparations for the congress proceeding in Moscow?

[Prokofyev] First of all, we are continuing a vigorous discussion of the available pre-congress documents, the Central Committee Platform and the draft party rules, in the primary organizations. We suggest that all Communists state frankly their remarks and proposals concerning improvements and amendments to these documents. In the process, we recommend to proceed not only from the documents prepared by the Central Committee of the party but also from alternative studies, in particular, the Democratic and Marxist platforms, the political position of a conference of the secretaries of a number of party organizations of the capital city, and other pre-congress documents published both in the mass press, including your newspaper, and in a special brochure which the party gorkom has distributed to all party organizations. We believe that all of these works have valuable, constructive elements which it is necessary to use in the course of preparing a single document capable of unifying the communists before the party congress.

[Yevseyev] Do you mean some document which will be developed even before the 28th Congress?

[Prokofyev] Yes, we intend to prepare our document by the time of the congress. Tentatively, it is going to be called the Position of the Moscow City Party Organization. I may say that the first version of the position has already been prepared. Recently, we discussed it at a meeting of the gorkom bureau; we are planning to forward it to the rayon committees of the party and primary organizations this week. Subsequently, we will hold a series conferences in the gorkom with the secretaries of party organizations in order to make the document being prepared more specific and submit it in May for a discussion at a plenum of the gorkom, consider it finally in June, and adopt it a city party conference.

[Yevseyev] Is it going to be published in the press after this?

[Prokofyev] I believe that it is feasible to publish it prior to the conference as a draft to be discussed by the Muscovites. In other words, we do not want to just transmit to the Central Committee suggestions and remarks by the communists of Moscow concerning the Central Committee Platform and the party rules but rather to generalize them ourselves and submit them to the congress as the opinion of the Moscow city party organization. To this end, we have set up two working groups in the gorkom for the rules and for the position.

[Yevseyev] Could you say who heads the groups?

[Prokofyev] The rules group is headed by Moscow CPSU City Committee Secretary Natalya Mikhaylovna Andreyanova. I head the group for developing the position; the group includes gorkom secretaries, social scientists, representatives of the Democratic and Marxist platforms... In a word, it is a large group which has already been gathering regularly and discussing the outline of the draft document in a most serious manner.

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, what if our readers want to send their considerations directly to these groups? What address should they be mailed to?

[Prokofyev] They should be mailed to the party gorkom. Let us agree to make pertinent marks on the envelopes, either "Rules" or "Position," in order to speed up the processing of the mail.

[Yevseyev] Thank you. I think the readers will take advantage of this opportunity. I would like to ask you about your personal impression of the progress in discussing the pre-congress documents. Are there any common attitudes among the communists of the capital city?

[Prokofyev] Perhaps, the most common point is that a majority of communists still agree that the documents submitted for discussion may provide a foundation for work on their improvement. However, we must say that attitudes toward them differ a lot in various organizations. The attitude in the scientific and research institutes and colleges is the most critical. However, this is what I have happened to encounter. In a number of cases, the people reject the documents worked out by the Central Committee of the party even without familiarizing themselves with the documents, flatly, as they say, only because the conservative, as they see it, composition of the present Central Committee cannot propose something constructive and new. In this reference, I would like to say that we in the gorkom compared the main provisions of the Central Committee Platform, the Democratic Platform, and the Marxist Platform. So, when we familiarize some avowed skeptics with this comparative analysis it becomes a virtual revelation for them. This prompts me to draw a sad conclusion: Many people assess the documents on the basis of who they were prepared by rather than their essence or nature. Personal and group sympathies and antipathies frequently get the upper hand over common sense.

[Yevseyev] Could it be that the people need to be helped and this comparative analysis should be published, say, in our newspaper?

[Prokofyev] I think it would be feasible right now, when—I will repeat once again—it is still possible to work out a unified platform facilitating the consolidation of a greater part of the Communists.

Who Is Going to Elect Central Committee Secretaries as Delegates?

[Yevseyev] There are many letters in the editorial mail on the issue of electing delegates to the party congress. Muscovites Ye. Dementyev, S. Churakov, O. Stepicheva, our reader from Tula V. Pleshakov, and many others are interested in this.

[Prokofyev] As is known, our city party organization was one of the initiators of electing delegates to the congress by a direct secret vote in party districts. This procedure has been adopted, though I for one may say that I do not consider it the most optimal.

[Yevseyev] This is quite an unexpected admission, Yuriy Anatolyevich...

[Prokofyev] Let me explain. The point is that this election system is quite cumbersome and fraught with bureaucratic costs because it entails setting up various precinct and district electoral commissions, holding many meetings, filling out many protocols, and so on. Personally, I believe that in the future we will go back to the old system of electing delegates to congresses at corresponding party conferences. However, as of now it is a forced and necessary measure, primarily because the lack of trust in the leading party organs among a certain segment of communists has become as acute as ever. Only direct elections in which every communist votes directly for a specific candidate delegate to the congress or the city party conference may resolve this. This is exactly why we opted for this, despite all the complexity and awkwardness of this system of elections, and defended persistently this very election procedure at the plenum of the Moscow City Committee and in the Appeal to the Central Committee of the Party.

[Yevseyev] Can a communist be elected to the congress only in the rayon party organization in which he is registered?

[Prokofyev] Yes, a majority of rayon party organizations in Moscow have decided so.

[Yevseyev] A majority but not all of them.

[Prokofyev] Not all of them. General guidelines for holding elections—direct, secret, multi-candidate, in party districts—have been adopted. The details of organizing them were decided by the raykoms [rayon party committees] themselves or at rayon conferences. At present, the nomination of candidates is still under way in Moscow, but I may say that by now more than 1,500 candidates have been nominated, whereas all of Moscow has fewer than 300 delegate seats. Therefore, the struggle is going to be intensive.

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, previously most leaders of the party Central Committee were, as a rule, elected delegates to the congress in Moscow. What about this time?

[Prokofyev] Once again, this is up to the communists themselves. For example, as of now, only three members of the Politburo have been nominated in Moscow: M.S. Gorbachev in Frunzenskiy Rayon, N.I. Ryzhkov in two districts of Leningradskiy Rayon, and A.N. Yakovlev in Khoroshevskiy Rayon. This is all for now.

[Yevseyev] Are the rest of the party leaders going to be elected in other oblasts?

[Prokofyev] In the oblasts where, unlike here, no decision has been made that only those registered in the party organization there are to be elected. Regulations adopted by the Central Committee do not prohibit this.

[Yevseyev] Have you, Yuriy Anatolyevich, been nominated as a candidate delegate?

[Prokofyev] Yes, in the party organization of the electrical equipment plant imeni Kuybyshev where I am registered. All secretaries of the gorkom are likewise registered in primary party organizations.

[Yevseyev] Are you looking at a competitive struggle for the right to become a congress delegate?

[Prokofyev] Certainly, like any communist. For example, three more people have been nominated apart

from me—the secretary of a party committee, an enterprise director, and a department manager at one of the industrial enterprises, also in the rayon.

[Yevseyev] Who are Gorbachev's competitors?

[Prokofyev] For now, there is only one, an employee of the Second Watch-Making Plant. However, the nomination of candidate delegates is still under way in that district. The point is that in various rayons of the capital city the elections will be held at different times—between 26 April and 5 May, as the rayon party organizations themselves decide.

Should Dissenters Be Expelled From the Party?

[Yevseyev] The recent Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee "For Consolidation on the Basis of Principles" has generated a lot of response. I might not even be able to name all the readers who have stated their opinion concerning this. I will only say that assessments of the letter are diametrically opposed at times. I would like to hear your opinion concerning this.

[Prokofyev] I believed and believe that under the circumstances the Central Committee has a duty to voice its point of view on the processes under way in the party.

[Yevseyev] Pardon me, Yuriy Anatolyevich, for interrupting you, but some readers are interested to know—why is this document called a letter of the Central Committee; after all, as is known, a plenum of the Central Committee was not convened to discuss it. Would it not be more proper to call it a letter of the Central Committee secretariat or apparatus?

[Prokofyev] A draft of the letter was sent to all members and alternate members of the Central Committee, and all of them had an opportunity to state their attitude toward it and make their corrections. In addition, the draft was sent to all first secretaries of the republic, kray, and oblast party organizations.

[Yevseyev] And the secretaries had an opportunity to discuss it with their aktiv?

[Prokofyev] They did, as we did in Moscow. We discussed the first and second versions of this letter with the secretaries of party raykoms and made our corrections in it.

[Yevseyev] Could you share with our readers what exact corrections you made?

[Prokofyev] Our position is as follows. As I have already said, we believed that the Central Committee must set forth its point of view in the situation in which the party is finding itself as several trends emerge within it on the eve of the congress. Of course, an intra-party discussion is not the point, and neither is the fact that several different policy platforms were prepared. The very objective of a discussion is to determine various points of view. However, the leaders of a number of platforms have transcended purely theoretical differences. They have taken practical, specific actions aimed at splitting the party before all of these issues are discussed at the congress. Say, the Democratic Platform held a meeting of their coordinating council on 19-20 March in which a decision was made to the effect that separation is unavoidable. Moreover, a mechanism for the formation of the proponents of the Democratic Platform has already been set in motion; a structure has been developed, beginning with the coordinating council of the country, a Moscow council, regional councils—that is, in effect, the creation of a parallel party has begun. Putting it mildly, such actions are improper on the eve of a congress.

Incidentally, I regard attempts of various action groups to set up the Russian Communist Party in exactly the same manner. Only a democratically elected forum representing all Communists of Russia is entitled to resolve this issue.

It is against such phenomena that the Central Committee had to make a statement.

[Yevseyev] However, some people interpreted the letter as a call to get rid of the dissenters, of the people who hold positions somewhat different from, say, that of the Central Committee Platform.

[Prokofyev] If we were to take this route the party should also get rid of me. After all, I criticized the Central Committee Platform both at the Central Committee Plenum and at the gorkom plenum. Incidentally, M.S. Gorbachev used this very example in his response to excessively "strict" demands of some comrades in the course of discussing the draft of the letter.

The adopted letter is not about separating from all those who think otherwise or offer their critical remarks on the position of the Central Committee. It is about separating from those who have already openly embarked on the road of splitting the party. If we are going to get rid of the people whose thinking is not in the mainstream we will have to return to a political monopoly which always brings about decay.

[Yevseyev] You said that changes were made in the draft of the letter. Did the things you disagreed with remain in the letter?

[Prokofyev] I would still express more clearly the main idea about separating from those who pursue the policy of a schism rather than with those who have somewhat different ideas. The wording was not sufficiently clear and this is why, as you said correctly, the letter was received in some party organizations as the beginning of a fight against dissenters.

[Yevseyev] Is the expulsion from the party of Associate Professor I. Chubays, of the State Institute of the Theatrical Art, a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Democratic Platform, in Krasnopresnenskiy Rayon, an example of this?

[Prokofyev] No. I. Chubays was not expelled because of his dissension or his position, though he personally tries to prove just that, but for quite open actions aimed at splitting the party which is convincingly confirmed by his own interviews to the mass media.

[Yevseyev] Have there been other cases of expulsions from the party in Moscow for reasons associated with the letter of the Central Committee?

[Prokofyev] A conversation was held in the Sverdlovskiy Rayon party committee with Yu. Afanasyev, rector of the History and Archives Institute . It was suggested that he determine his position. After this conversation, he himself submitted a petition on leaving the party. I am not aware of other cases.

Well, we've got to face up to the truth. Certainly, separation in the party is unavoidable. However, by no means should it resemble the infamous "purge." Perhaps, it is worthwhile to hold an exchange of party documents after the congress. If an individual accepts the platform of this party and its rules he exchanges his party membership card for a new one; if he does not he just quits the party automatically and may join a political organization whose spirit he finds more appealing.

This is a legitimate process. Given the current conditions of pluralism of opinions and the stratification of our society, no one party can be the party of the entire people, much less the Communist Party. Meanwhile, at present there are also people within its ranks who believe frankly that it would be more proper to take the country along a capitalist path of development; there are people who subscribe to antisocialist positions; there are those who share chauvinist views; there also are shadow economy operators... Let us also be frank: A considerable number of office-seekers joined the Communist Party under the one-party system, when it determined the cadre policy of the country. Besides, we maintained the social composition of the party, and in a number of cases admitted people by virtue of their social background rather than convictions. The time has come to correct all of this. Let the party grow smaller in numbers, but it will become stronger.

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, how has the size of the membership of the Moscow party organization changed recently?

[Prokofyev] It has dropped. In the first three months of this year, 6,000 people left the party. This is only two times fewer than in all of last year.

[Yevseyev] How many people have joined?

[Prokofyev] This year, about 1,000 people have joined the party. However, these people have not joined the party under a quota system or in order to advance their careers. This means that they can be relied upon.

Why the Two Stages of the City Conference?

[Yevseyev] Simultaneously with the elections of candidates to the 28th CPSU Congress, delegates to the 28th Moscow City Party Conference are going to be elected. How is it going to be held and when?

[Prokofyev] A plenum of the Moscow City CPSU Committee resolved to hold the city conference in two stages. At the first stage, in June, we are to determine our position with regard to the policy platform of the Central Committee and our attitude toward the draft party rules, and make suggestions for improving them further. In addition, we suggest that proposals be prepared by our city party organization regarding candidates to the central party organs at the same, first stage of the conference. We intend to collect such proposals beginning with primary organizations and rayon party conferences in order to be able to establish a common point of view at the city conference and to submit the proposals.

[Yevseyev] Is this being done for the first time?

[Prokofyev] As far as the central party organs are concerned, for the first time. However, we practiced this with regard to the city party organs during the last reports-and-elections campaign. I must say that not one person was elected to the city committee of the party then who had not been recommended by primary organizations. To be sure, considerably more candidates had been recommended; some of them had dropped out at the rayon level. However, in principle, the entire current composition of the Moscow City Committee consists of people whose election at the conference was "sanctioned" exactly in the primary organizations. We believe that this practice should now also be extended to the Central Committee level.

We will hold the second stage of the city party conference immediately after the party congress. We will elect a new composition of the Moscow City CPSU Committee at that time, when we already have a new political platform, new rules, and, perhaps, the results of separation in the party—in other words, a qualitatively changed Moscow city party organization.

Will "the Bloc System" Be Preserved in the Moscow Soviet?

[Yevseyev] The proceedings of a Moscow Soviet session with a new composition are of great interest to Muscovites. Groups, blocs, factions—these still quite unusual words have recently been applied every now and then to the operation of the "Moscow parliament." What is your personal assessment of the first days of work of the session in your capacity as Moscow Soviet people's deputy and as first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee?

[Prokofyev] First of all, I would like to use this occasion in order to congratulate Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov and Sergey Borisovich Stankevich on their election to the positions of chairman and deputy chairman of the

Moscow Soviet. I would like to hope that the new leadership of the Moscow Soviet and the Moscow City CPSU organization will cooperate fruitfully in the name of prosperity of Muscovites and in the name of the capital city which all of us love.

As far as your question about the bloc system which has now emerged in the Moscow Soviet is concerned, I must say that I have come out against it from the very beginning. Blocs could exist during the election campaign in order to provide certain aid to particular candidate deputies with a view to getting them elected to the Moscow Soviet. This is natural because a multi-party system is actually already emerging here. However, it seemed to me that blocs should not exist in the city soviet after the deputy corps of the Moscow Soviet is formed, because the goals and tasks of all of us are common—caring for the good of the Muscovites, our voters. In the soviet, teachers, physicians, ecology specialists, and so on could form factions—that is, deputies who would defend the interests of their branch, their sector. Meanwhile, rigid, essentially political blocs have evolved in our case: "Democratic Russia," "Moscow," "The Independents," "Otechestvo." Undoubtedly, this bloc character has affected the work of the session itself. It was particularly difficult during the initial days, when political ambitions of the representatives of various blocs at times eclipsed common sense. For example, an entire day was spent in a heated debate concerning the agenda. Ultimately, it was adopted the same as it was proposed by the organizational committee, to the last word. Of course, the lack of experience of "parliamentary" work by a majority of deputies is a factor. However, let us hope that experience can be gained, and that our work is going to be more productive later.

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, in our last interview we talked about the possibility of the Communist Party being the opposition in a particular soviet. Can we say that this has happened in the Moscow Soviet? What is going to be the tactic of the communists of Moscow in the new situation?

[Prokofyev] A very unusual situation has emerged in the Moscow Soviet by now. On the one hand, 59 percent of the deputies are CPSU members; on the other hand, for some of them this membership is a mere formality at present. Still, let us not talk about opposition for the time being; let us wait at the very least until the congress is over and, hopefully, the political positions of all are shown as definitively as can be.

As far as the Moscow CPSU Gorkom is concerned, I would like to stress once again that we are going to support all positive endeavors which are proposed by any group as long as they are in the interest of the Muscovites. Moreover, I believe that the representatives of different blocs will also find common ground after the session resolves all procedural issues, finally creates the leading organs of the city and the Executive Committee of the Moscow Soviet, and when the deputies plunge into routine concerns.

[Yevseyev] Thank you, Yuriy Anatolyevich, for a frank conversation. Let us hope that by the time of our forthcoming meeting we will have more pleasant topics for a discussion.

[Prokofyev] I also hope so. See you in May.

Leningrad Oblast 19 Apr Election Results Reviewed

WA1805201190 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 p 3

["List of People's Deputies of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet Elected on 19 April 1990"]

[Text] Badalyants, Khoren Azarapetovich, born 1933, member of the CPSU, general director of the Pikalevo production alumina association "Glinozem" imeni 50th Anniversary of the USSR, resident of the city of Pikalevo, Boksitogorskiy Rayon. District No. 8.

Vaneyev, Yuriy Artemyevich, born 1937, member of the CPSU, chairman of the Kingisepp City Committee of the trade union of state institution employees, resident of the village of Kaskolovka, Kingiseppskiy Rayon. District No. 129.

Vorontsov, Aleksey Vasilyevich, born 1941, member of the CPSU, head of the ideological department of the CPSU Leningrad Obkom [oblast party committee], resident of the City of Leningrad. District No. 60.

Gavrilova, Tatyana Fedorovna, born 1950, member of the CPSU, member of the apparat of the "Fosforit" production association, resident of the City of Kingisepp. District No. 128.

Gustov, Vadim Anatolyevich, born 1948, member of the CPSU, chairman of the Kingisepp City Soviet of People's Deputies, resident of the City of Kingisepp. District No. 127.

Georgiyev, Valentin Aleksandrovich, born 1952, nonparty, driver at the Kingisepp agricultural industrial equipment enterprise, resident of the City of Kingisepp. District No. 125.

Denisov, Yuriy Aleksandrovich, born 1945, member of the CPSU, secretary of the CPSU Leningrad Obkom, resident of the City of Leningrad. District No. 231.

Yegorov, Aleksandr Vasilyevich, born 1948, member of the CPSU, director of the "Sumino" sovkhoz [state farm], resident of the village of Sumino, Volosovskiy Rayon. District No. 13.

Kokarev, Aleksandr Petrovich, born 1947, member of the CPSU, chairman of the Kirovsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, resident of the City of Otradnoye, Kirovskiy Rayon. District No. 155.

Klimov, Vitaliy Nikolayevich, born 1952, member of the CPSU, director of the Narva GES-13 [hydroelectric

power plant], resident of the City of Ivangorod, Kingiseppskiy Rayon. District No. 131.

Konovalov, Valeriy Sergeyevich, born 1952, member of the CPSU, first deputy secretary of the executive committee of the Gatchinskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies, resident of the village of Novyy Svet, Gatchinskiy Rayon. District No. 119.

Lutsenko, Nikolay Maksimovich, born 1944, nonparty, electrician of the housing block boiler production association Tosno Housing Municipal Service, resident of the City of Tosno. District No. 236.

Medvedev, Anatoliy Fedorovich, born 1937, member of the CPSU, deputy editor of the newspaper VYBORGSKIY KOMMUNIST, resident of the City of Vyborg. District No. 64.

Semidedko, Vladimir Petrovich, born 1945, member of the CPSU, head doctor of the Tikhvinskiy Rayon medical and epidemiological station, resident of the City of Tikhvin. District No. 221.

Syrnikov, Aleksandr Sergeyevich, born 1940, member of the CPSU, department head of the US-20/4 institution, resident of the village of Fornosovo, Tosnenskiy Rayon. District No. 242.

Solovyev, Vyacheslav Pavlovich, born 1940, member of the CPSU, head of the Tosno automotive depot, resident of the City of Tosno. District No. 246.

Ulyanov, Vladimir Vsevolodovich, born 1961, member of the CPSU, secretary of the Vsevolozhsk City Committee of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], resident of the City of Leningrad. District No. 39.

Yakovlev, Vladimir Vasilyevich, born 1931, member of the CPSU, teacher at the Aleksovshchina Secondary School, resident of the town of Aleksovshchina, Lodneynopolskiy Rayon. District No. 164.

[signed] Leningrad Oblast Electoral Commission

Speeches at Leningrad Joint Party Conference

90UN1816A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 90 pp 2, 3

[Speeches by participants in the joint conference of Leningrad Oblast and city party organizations of the CPSU]

[Excerpts] **I.M. Rukhin, rolling mill operator at Kirov Zavod Association**

Esteemed comrades in the party! I ask you to listen carefully to the working class; we listened carefully to you and now it is your turn. We have met in the large council at a time that is very critical for the party because at this moment emphasis should be placed on tasks of creating a more-or-less tolerable life, and after that we can discuss party problems. If we do not do this the people will turn away from you once and for all, and then the efficiency factor of our conference will be zero.

People are expecting effective decisions from us and not a lot of words—they have had it with words. The same kind of critical situation was created because of gross mistakes and an unwillingness to see the real state of affairs, and because both the former and present party leadership ignored the opinion of the main mass of Communists. Under Stalin there was mass destruction of the people's gene pool, under Khrushchev there was the great corn epic, and under Brezhnev there was mass destruction of the forests and the creation of "nut houses" for people guilty of wrong-headedness. The dawn of the great stagnation came and this disease did not bypass the present leadership headed by M.S. Gorbachev—the notorious battle against alcoholism and the idea of cooperatives that was not completely thought through. As a result, super-thieves appeared—cooperatives such as Tekhnika, ANT [Automation, Science, and Technology], and so forth, which undermines the common good with the reliable protection of the ministers. All this has brought immense material and nonmaterial losses to the country.

Our greatest problem is that we seem to agree to all this. So many wonderful plans and programs have been undertaken for the good of man and on man's behalf. They have been surrounded by the worst political blather and then they were not carried out or were forgotten without any ado. This is how the party has gradually lost its authority. Why have our affairs gone so extremely badly? Because to this day we are not embodying in life the most important slogans of the October Revolution: "Peace—to the people," "The land—to the peasants," "The factories—to the workers," and "Power—to the soviets."

Comrades! The speech by Comrade B.V. Gidaspov at the 11th Congress of People's Deputies was heard with immense attention. This shows that the entire country is expecting advanced ideas and works from Leningrad. Unfortunately, we still have little to boast about. Comrade Gidaspov began his activity in the post of first secretary with a bang and we now thought that things would really get off the ground, but no such thing happened. After the notorious rallies and the publication of the platforms of the Leningrad communists, the first secretary, gorkom [city committee], and obkom [oblast committee] made themselves scarce and left affairs in the city and oblast to run themselves. Apparently the general secretary and the Politburo lightly reproved Comrade B.V. Gidaspov for this hastiness. As a result the situation in Leningrad sharply deteriorated and the authority of the party organization is at a very low level at this time. Elections to local and republic soviets were lost.

The people judge our work from their daily life; and their life, unfortunately, is becoming worse and worse, which is shown by the empty shelves in stores, the terrible speculation, and the immense waiting lines. The people

have had enough of our promises. Hostility has reached the extreme in the country. There are open appeals for destruction of the communists. Not everyone is up to being a communist in this stage. And what has the obkom done in this situation? Perhaps it has figured out why there are goods at the bazaars and not in the stores, why shortage goods end up in the hands of speculators, and where the goods are going if the plants and factories are working at full capacity. Perhaps it has introduced order and decency in the city and oblast and eliminated the mafia in the market. Unfortunately, the answer is no.

Drop in any store and it will immediately become obvious from the official signs: For disabled persons only, for war veterans only, for families with many children, for Afghanistan veterans only, and so forth. It turns out that millions of people such as myself are odd men out in the society. We must increase the production of goods and not engage in the redistribution of them, and not put up all kinds of signs—then our life will be normal. The obkom should set for itself concrete feasible tasks and organize the party organization for the performance of these tasks. And in order for the whole of society to know what the tasks are and how they are being carried out it is necessary to organize a program like "600 Seconds" and discuss the course of the work there, the deadlines, and the responsibility of the leaders for the poor state of affairs. The work of the obkom will be clearly evident to everyone everyday.

Leningrad is the pearl of the country, and we must protect it for posterity; therefore, Leningrad must be granted the status of a Union republic. Leningrad has more than 120 ministries and departments which have absolutely no concern for our city, and therefore the city should have one master—the Leningrad Soviet. No less than 50 percent of the profit should be left in Leningrad so it could be put into the proper order. In conjunction with the Leningrad Soviet, the party obkom must develop a realistic plan and strictly adhere to it.

Comrades! There is a mass exodus of workers from the party—this is a very dangerous phenomenon. At the Kirov plant during the past year 297 people left the party. During the first quarter of this year—488, or 62 percent of the workers. Loss of faith in the party is forcing the workers to organize new structures. There is now a tendency to remove workers from power with the justification that professionals should be in charge. This leads to nothing good. All this leads to separation into classes.

No authority, no party can exist without the mass media, and therefore this issue must be made completely clear and the media must be shared with the Leningrad Soviet under the law.

The party has property, and a good deal of it. This property must be left in the party in reasonable form, and all surpluses must be liquidated and turned over to the party so that there are no disputes of any kind.

Comrades! The campaign under way that says that agricultural workers must cope with their own problems without help from the city is unreasonable, to put it mildly. What has such a powerful scientific and technical center as Leningrad done for agriculture? Unfortunately, very little. There is a very great deal of manual labor in agriculture and therefore the city must do everything it can to help agriculture feed the population. This is a most important political task. Leningrad should provide an example for the rest of the country of how to help agriculture. We must involve the institutes and plants in the creation of agricultural machinery, storage facilities, agricultural equipment, and technology, and we absolutely must help the rural areas with people. We have experience in this at our plant. Our suggestions: Definitely retain the party organizations at the enterprises—without this, purposeful work by the party is unthinkable; take a strict position regarding party property; and in order for work in the local party organizations not to follow the current or be left uncontrolled, it would be expedient to organize under the party obkom a coordinating organ for work with the local party organizations.

I thank you for your attention!

(Applause)

[Passage omitted]

I.D. Stikhin, pilot at the Vyborg seaport

Comrade communists! In the question of renewing the party, two platforms come to the fore. And both of them claim the name of the CPSU. Whether or not this is true needs to be determined.

At the outset let us turn our attention to the fact that it says in the provisions of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU that its proponents, like all the CPSU, stand on principles of democratic socialism. Do the activists of the Democratic Platform mean by the principles of democratic socialism the ideas of social-democracy? If so, then it would probably follow that the coordination council of the Democratic Platform should declare the creation of a social- democratic party and not take cover under their platform in the CPSU. The more so since in the resolutions adopted at the meetings of the coordination council during 18-19 March in Moscow the clarification "in the CPSU" was omitted.

We shall argue in this case and we shall look jointly for new paths.

Of course the draft of the Central Committee platform is an incomplete program document. But still one is disturbed by its declarative nature and the vagueness of many of its points and certain formulations. In the Central Committee platform as in the regulations there is no clearcut position regarding prompt formation of the Russian Communist Party, democratic centralism under the new conditions, or protection of the rights of the minority in the party. And the Democratic Platform gives a clearer description of its provisions in the society

and the party. It gives an alignment of forces in the party and attitudes toward the Democratic Platform are already acquiring the nature of a discussion.

The Democratic Platform is appropriating the right to the truth in the highest instance as the group that is fighting for a radical reform of the CPSU. And all the others are either conservative Stalinists or moderate reformers. Just try to disagree with the Democratic Platform and you will immediately be dubbed a slave to routine or an evil Stalinist.

The position of the Democratic Platform requires analysis. There arises the question of who stands behind its coordinating council. The logical assumption is that the initiators are a group of radical reformers pursuing their own ambitious goals in the struggle for power. Those who made themselves known in the activity of the interregional group of deputies. But the composition of this group is alarming. It includes Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, who deserves the support and sympathy of both communists and nonparty members because of his courage and unorthodox approach to solving many problems. It includes People's Deputies Alekseyev and Shatalin who consider themselves to be social democrats and say so openly. There are many who are the people's choice among proponents of the Democratic Platform, people who are truly concerned about the state of affairs in the country. But there is also Deputy Afanasyev and the unassailable group of economists Zaslavskaya, Shmelev, Popov, and others. There is the economics staff, which is largely responsible for the economic crisis in which the country has found itself today. People's Deputy Sobchak speaks of the responsibility of those who are to blame for their failure to fulfill and carry out programs. But perhaps the main ones who should be called to account are those who developed these programs on the scale of the country and those who came up with justification for throwing away hundreds of billions of rubles on "great projects." Or those who, showing that they had no future, caused the destruction of 240,000 Russian villages.

Incidentally, you will find no points about socioeconomic tasks in the Democratic Platform. Nothing is said about the country's economy. Is this by accident? After all, any party that achieves influence proclaims principles of social justice—such as the right to work and fair distribution of the results of labor.

Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, who was the first to speak about the prospects of the socialist market, had some good things to say. But nonetheless the market still presupposes unemployment, and this violates one of the principles of socialism: the right to work. This must be discussed in a straightforward manner. And the introduction of joint stock enterprises? Certain enterprises pay their workers or, rather, give them the opportunity to buy shares for R10,000 and more. But if enterprising businessmen buy shares for R100,000-200,000 and more they can live well without burdening themselves. For the earnings from these shares are more than the interest in savings banks. Would this not be a violation of another principle of socialism—distribution according not to labor but to monetary investments.

Money is transformed into capital. A new bourgeoisie is appearing. It is not noted in the one document or the other, but this means that they are not giving a correct evaluation of the situation. Work under the conditions of a multiparty system requires the consolidation of party forces in all segments of the society—unification on a unified platform whose basic directions are given in the document of the Central Committee.

It is also necessary to take into account the proposals presented in the Democratic Platform.

Understanding the decisions, we mut envision the danger that we Communists will become an implement in the struggle of influential groups fighting for their personal participation in the wielding of power. Will we be given a guarantee that one partocracy will not be replaced by another? For us, the majority of Communists, the rank- and-file members of the party, there are no particular obstacles to consolidation. [passage omitted]

V.A. Tyulkin, party committee secretary of the Avangard Association

Comrades! I am in an extremely difficult position since, as many know, I was a member of the committee for preparing for the party conference of the Russian communists who were delegates to the 28th party congress and for a large amount of the time I was the chairman of the initiating congress of communists of Russia which has already been mentioned here repeatedly. I signed up for a discussion on precisely this subject; but the floor has been turned over to me now, and therefore I am warning you ahead of time that I will not stay within the prescribed subject matter.

I shall make a suggestion at the outset since I understand that everyone has a different evaluation of the events for the creation of the Russian Communist Party: I ask that you decide today whether or not I will be allowed to continue my work as the chairman of the Leningrad party organization on the preparations committee under the Central Committee which is preparing for the conference, or will we make a replacement during the course of the meeting. Now, down to the essence of the issue.

Should there or should there not be a Russian Communist Party as a part of the CPSU? The question is still open. We recall the results of the Leningrad referendum, and we recall that this question was clearly reflected in the platform of the Leningrad communists.

As Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov said, this platform was highly rated by the leadership, including the Central Committee, and found broad response throughout the country. It was probably for this reason that our platform did not end up in the central press. And moreover, although we know that Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned

it in positive terms at least three times in his speech at the plenum, for some reason this did not appear in the text presented in the central press either, the newspaper PRAVDA included. Therefore it has become clear to many communists and local party organizations that under these conditions our opinion simply must be supported by a movement from below. We formed an initiating committee which conducted this work and set as its goal to hold an initiating congress of Communists of the Russian republic who had spoken out in favor of giving organizational form to the unity of Communists working in Russia.

The next point: Many people place great hopes in the Russian party conference that is in the making; they hope that it will be able to grow into a constituent congress and will resolve this issue. Others hope that the path taken by the Leningrad initiating committee will be juxtaposed to the course of the Central Committee.

I am reporting the following to you: On 3 April I participated in the work of the preparations commission in Moscow. The meeting was conducted by Mikhail Sergeyevich. In the tone-setting reports of Mikhail Sergeyevich and Comrade Manayenkov it was suggested to the preparations committee, having weighed all the pros and cons, that it consider the question of creating a party organization of our republic premature and harmful to the cause of perestroyka and that it engage in practical questions of preparing for the conference, beginning with the reports and ending with the location for conducting the cultural program, and so forth.

But the majority of members of the preparations committee considered this wrong and were able to agree on the following: This issue should be resolved not by the Central Committee, where detachments of generally respected communists from other republics are present, and not by the bureau for Russia under the Central Committee which through its active work has won "popularity" in party circles, and not by ourselves as members of the preparations committee—this issue had to be resolved by the local party organizations themselves, the communists of Russia, and nobody but them.

We reached an agreement to prepare an appeal which would weigh all the pros and cons and ask the party organization to make a statement. It was suggested that this appeal should be prepared within 10 days; but more than 20 have already passed. The Central Committee is still not being asked to coordinate it, although we have already drawn up drafts as initiatives.

And, finally, right there, in the preparations committee, we reached an agreement: In no case either to oppose or ignore a single initiating committee or group, and there are many working on this issue throughout Russia. On the contrary, we decided to establish bilateral contact with all of them and include them in our work.

There, too, I gave detailed information about the initiating conference that was being prepared in Leningrad. And many of those who were present on 21-22 April were members of the preparations commission for the Russian conference or had received information from them.

I wish to note that the delegates to the congress, who represented 1.5 million communists in Russia, adopted the resolution, which was completely public, and insisted on the publication of all the congress documents so that comrades I respect would not judge it from the fragmentary, frequently unobjective information which is now being conveyed in the mass media... As an example I can mention the newspaper PRAVDA, which the day after the congress announced that a decision had been adopted concerning the need to give organizational form to the republic's party organization after the 28th party congress (?!) even though the decision had been adopted before the 28th congress. Moreover, we have been convinced that our truth exists in several variants—according to the regional principle. The version that came out for the majority of regions of Russia says—before the 28th congress. So if the newspaper PRAVDA can play these jokes, what can we expect from the rest of the media?

I shall conclude my speech with an appeal to have just one point when we vote on the resolution today. You can criticize whatever you like in the decree of the initiating congress and its resolution, but I ask that you support one point: simply that it is necessary to give organizational form to the unity of the party organization of our republic (Russian Communist Party) before the 28th party congress. After the congress it might simply be too late.

As a member of the committee for preparing for the conference, I shall simply not follow any other line. If it is not coordinated with the opinion of the majority here, I will ask to be replaced.

Leningrad Party Conference Holds Elections

90UN1860A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 90 p 1

[Article by V. Koshvanets: "The Election Psychology"]

[Text] Yesterday the joint conference of Leningrad Oblast and city party organizations of the CPSU continued its work in the Tavricheskiy Palace.

Those readers who followed the work of the conference with some attention at the end of April would probably remember that the delegates nominated their candidates for the bureau and for oblast party committee [obkom] secretaries before they broke up for the holidays. The list of candidates emerged as a result of long and heated discussions and it looked rather lengthy. Four people were nominated, for instance, for the position of obkom second secretary, five people were selected for secretary for ideology and political work with the masses. There were five nominees for a post we are not used to hearing about yet—secretary for cooperation with the public and political organizations and movements, problems of

young people's policy, and party foreign relations. As for the posts of secretary for agrarian policy and secretary for socio-economic policy, there were three candidates selected for each of those. And there were more than 30 people in the list of candidates for the obkom bureau.

Yesterday the delegates had to decide which of the candidates they wanted to choose. During the first days of the conference it was decided to select the bureau and the secretaries only from party obkom members and therefore some of the would-be candidates were excluded from the competition. However, the choice was not made much easier by that decision.

I would like to say a few words before I start describing the election procedure. Usually a journalist has to resort to all kinds of stylistic gimmicks and tricks in reporting such events, so that the article is at least somewhat dynamic. Really, what can be more boring than a description of how the nominees were discussed and voted for?

But yesterday the discussion and the voting procedure helped me resolve all my journalistic problems. There was more than a sufficient dose of constant emotional pressure, pointed confrontations of opinions and stands, and unexpectedly dramatic changes. As in every drama, the finale often depended on purely psychological aspects, be it a fitting word, an appropriate answer, or the candidate's ability to be sincere with the audience.

To my mind, these very angles helped, in particular, to select the party obkom second secretary from four nominees. Two of them, A.I. Aleksandrov, first secretary of the CPSU Moskovskiy Raykom [rayon party committee], and D.N. Filippov, party obkom secretary, withdrew their nominations in the course of the discussion. The invisible struggle was waged then between the two remaining contenders. I am sure there were a number of people willing to forecast victory for either one. Both V.K. Borisov, first secretary of the CPSU Krasnogvardeyskiy Raykom, and V.V. Yashin, first secretary of Krasnoselskiy Raykom, are relatively young, both are quite experienced in party work, well known to the workers and to the party activists of their respective rayons. What is just as important, both successfully emerged from the ordeal of the preelection campaign and became people's deputies of the Leningrad City Soviet. During the discussion the candidates heard a lot of good words spoken about them.

But then the discussion was over, the delegates were given secret ballots with the names of Borisov and Yashin and in the hall of Tavricheskiy Palace one could hear more and more often the confident: "Yashin will win, for sure." Jumping ahead I can tell you that proved true. Of 933 delegates, 531 voted for Yashin and 402 against him. V.K. Borisov had 275 votes for him and 658 against. That happened in spite of the recommendations made the day before by the party obkom plenum, where they suggested that Borisov should be elected second secretary. Possibly, however, this very recommendation did a bad service to the contender, i.e. "if they recommend him we will vote against." This happens rather often now at different meetings and conferences.

But in my opinion, the final touch that changed the balance to Yashin's advantage was added by V.K. Borisov himself, whether he wanted it or not. He made the required short speech to the delegates and answered their questions and in the course of this he sounded somewhat unsure of himself or sometimes almost pompous as he spoke in generalities. Yashin, on the contrary, was quite precise and businesslike; he showed sufficient self-criticism and sincerity even when he had to face what we call provocative questions. Take, for instance, just this one: "Would you like to give up a part of your salary?" "No, I would not," said Valeriy Vasilyevich, "I have a family of four and now that I am making more money we have finally started living more or less normally."

I hope greatly that this openness, which was appreciated by the delegates of the conference, will also be appreciated by our readers. I also hope they will not start raging and fuming right away about the "spoiled" bureaucrat.

No less dramatic was the election of the secretary for ideology and political work with the masses. As I have already said, there were five nominees for the post. However, two of them, A.A. Denisov, people's deputy and USSR Supreme Soviet member, and V.V. Kalashnikov, a department chairman of the Leningrad Electrical Engineering Institute imeni V.I. Lenin, withdrew their nominations. Two more, Yu.P. Belov, secretary of Smolninskiy Raykom and V.V. Fortunatov, a department head of the Institute of Railroad Transportation and Engineering, dropped out as they were not obkom members. As a result only one person was on the ballot, CPSU Obkom Secretary Yu.A. Denisov. Could this "proud singleness," so unpopular now, have preordained the result of the vote? The result was as follows: 457 of the delegates voted for Yu.A. Denisov and 477—against him. But more probably Yuriy Aleksandrovich failed because of the general pitiful state of the ideological work in the country and in the region, as well as because of the mistakes and shortcomings of his own performance. And to give him credit we must say that he admitted them all. Now we have new nominations and the election of the secretary for ideology and political work with the masses ahead of us.

The elections proceeded in a rather unpredictable way. Suffice it to say that the position of secretary for socio-economic policy remained vacant also. After all the nominees for the post were discussed the following names were entered on the secret ballots: I.A. Korsakov, first secretary of the CPSU Primorskiy Raykom, and V.F. Polosin, first deputy head of the socio-economic department of the CPSU Obkom. Neither of them got the necessary number of votes.

Members of the obkom bureau were elected at the conference.

E.I. Kalinina was elected obkom secretary for cooperation with the public and political organizations and movements, problems of young people's policy, and party foreign relations. Previously she was in charge of the ideology department of the Leningrad Gorkom [city party committee]. The CPSU Obkom secretary for agrarian policy, A.V. Pavlov, was elected to his previous position.

The conference adopted a resolution on the results of the general discussion. Among these results was a decision to form unified electoral organs for the Leningrad party organizations—the CPSU Oblast Committee and Control and Auditing Commission. They also adopted the resolutions "About the Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee to the Communists of the Country" and "On the Attitude To the Initiating Congress of Russian Communists."

In their address to the deputies of Leningrad oblast and city soviets the delegates of the conference called for their cooperation when resolving political, social, and economic problems.

The delegates sent a telegram to participants in the PRAVDA festival and congratulated them on Press Day and on the anniversary of one of the oldest newspapers in the Soviet state. They also sent a telegram of congratulations on the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory to the Great Patriotic War and Labor Veterans and to those who lived through the blockade of Leningrad.

V.N. Lobko, CPSU Central Committee deputy department head, took part in the conference, as well as some other high ranking officials of the party Central Committee.

The conference then concluded the first stage of its work. The next session will take place on 8 June.

Western Republics

Belorussian People's Front Hold Mass Meeting

90UN1328A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 26 Feb 90 p 1

[Statement of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Belorussian Council of Ministers]

[Text] Our republic has started a wide range of multifaceted work to prepare for the elections of the people's deputies for the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and local soviets. The candidates for deputies are conducting numerous meetings and discussions of issues with their constituencies. There they usually talk in a businesslike and constructive manner about the current socioeconomic and political problems. The same can be said about a number of rallies held in several cities on 24 and 25 March.

On 25 March a mass meeting was held, with official permission, in the city of Minsk. An informal association which calls itself the Belorussian People's Front [BNF] acted as its immediate organizer. The leaders of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the republic Council of Ministers, and the oblast and city party committees considered that the pre-election issues indicated in the permit application were quite important and decided to participate in the event also.

Some of the speakers talked about how dissatisfied they were with the work of the party, soviet, and economic organizations where it concerned improving people's life and conditions of their work, as well as developing the democratic processes. Chernobyl presented an especially exciting and critical subject for discussion. There were also complaints about the drawbacks in the election campaign.

The organizers of the meeting unfortunately broke their promises as they were exploiting the current shortcomings and difficulties without any constructive input. Instead they resorted to provocative speeches, disinformation, and slander. Some speakers went as far as to insist that the Belorussian Communist Party was the most reactionary and the most antipopular in its character. They called the ideology of that party "a national nihilism." At the same time they accused the party organs of a most abhorrent action—stirring up the interethnic feud.

Having accused everyone and everything of undemocratic methods, the organizers of the meeting, in fact, called in their appeal for actions which cannot be resorted to when creating a rule-of-law state.

The BNF leaders, in their desire to gain power, made a stake on dictatorship. At the meeting they proclaimed that they did not wish to have any dialog or mutual contacts with the constitutional organs of power in the republic.

The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Belorussian Council of Ministers denounce these unacceptable actions which may only lead to a civil confrontation.

We call upon the communists and nonparty members, upon all the working people of the republic, upon the women, young people, and veterans to protect the law and the principles of the socialist democracy and glasnost, to intensify their work with all the informal movements that are ready for businesslike cooperation, to stand decisively against those who try to heat up and destabilize the atmosphere in the republic. Because we share the concern of the people for the sociopolitical situation and for the state of things in the economic, social, and other spheres, let us all direct our mutual effort and energy to the realization of the noble goals of perestroyka.

[Signed] The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

Belorussian Leadership Changes Announced

90UN1676B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 1

[Text] **Informational Report on the Plenum of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee**

The 18th Plenum of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee was convened on 7 April in Minsk. Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, opened the plenum. The application of M.V. Kovalev for release from his post of chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers in connection with his retirement was discussed. The plenum agreed to Kovalev's request and expressed gratitude to him for his many years of fruitful activity in the socioeconomic development of the republic, and for his active efforts within the Belorussian Communist Party.

As a result of secret voting with competing candidates, the plenum recommended V.F. Kebich, deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Belorussian SSR State Planning Committee, to the post of chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

The plenum drafted A.I. Kostenko, Belorussian Military District commander of forces, to membership in the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and elected him member of the Central Committee Bureau.

The plenum transferred M.I. Misuno, first secretary of the Minsk Gorkom [city committee] of the Belorussian Communist Party, from the status of candidate member to member of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

At this point the plenum concluded its work.

Ukase of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet: On the Appointment of Comrade V.F. Kebich as Chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

To appoint Comrade Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] N. Dementey. Chairman of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

L. Syroyegina. Secretary of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

7 April 1990, Minsk.

Chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich

Born in 1936, V.F. Kebich is Belorussian and a CPSU member since 1962. He completed the Belorussian Polytechnic Institute and Minsk Higher Party School, and is a mechanical engineer by specialty.

He began his career in 1958 and proceeded from a position as production engineer at the Minsk Automated Production Lines Plant to the post of general director of the Minsk Production Association for Output of Cutting and Broaching Lathes imeni S.M. Kirov. In 1980 he was elected second secretary of the Minsk Party Gorkom [city committee]. In 1983 he served as head of the heavy industry department of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and then second secretary of the Minsk Obkom [oblast committee] of the Belorussian Communist Party.

Since December 1985 he has been deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Belorussian SSR State Planning Committee.

Comrade Kebich is a member of the Central Committee Bureau of the Belorussian Communist Party and a USSR people's deputy. He has twice been awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor. He has received the Badge of Honor, two medals, and three meritorious service awards of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. He is a Belorussian SSR State Prize laureate and has been conferred the honorary title of Meritorious Mechanical Engineer of the Belorussian SSR.

Ukase of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet on the Release of Comrade M.V. Kovalev from the Position of Chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers"

The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

To release Comrade Mikhail Vasilyevich Kovalev from the position of chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers in connection with his retirement.

[Signed] N. Dementey, chairman of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

L. Syroyegina, secretary of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

7 April 1990, Minsk.

Belorussia's Sokolov Views Current Party Tasks

WA1605193990 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 18 Apr 90 pp 1, 2

[Report on interview with Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, by the SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA editorial office: "Time for Decisions and Action"; date and place not specified]

[Text] The Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee to the country's communists was published recently.

Raising problems of tremendous importance, it immediately came to be the focus of attention not only of party members but of all Soviet people. The letter is being discussed with interest in the party organizations and the work force. Many readers have questions in this connection and would like clarification of certain propositions of the documents and precise estimates of the situation in the Belorussian Communist Party and in the republic.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] Yefrem Yevseyevich, what was the reason for the Central Committee's appeal to the country's communists? As a member of the CPSU Central Committee, what is your view of the situation in our republic? To what extent are the problems raised in the letter typical of the Belorussian Communist Party?

[Sokolov] To be frank, preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress are proceeding under difficult conditions. Complex, contradictory processes are taking place in society and the party. True, in the course of the precongress debate the majority of communists and nonparty persons has supported the key ideas of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism." It is on this path that people see a renewal of the party itself and of all of society.

At the same time, however, the keen debate is also revealing our "sore" points and making adjustments and amplifications to our plans. All this is natural inasmuch as it reflects the diversity of the views which exist in society and in the party. People are offering their vision of a solution of socioeconomic problems, the removal of the conflicts on interethnic grounds and defense against separatist tendencies.

New movements and every conceivable alliance are appearing on the political scene in the country, and several currents have taken shape in the CPSU itself. Competition of ideas and a quest for the best methods of operation are only to the benefit of any party. But given one indispensable condition: This competition and quest should unfailingly move in the stream of the strategic course and contribute to the consolidation of all healthy forces.

We are for dialogue with everyone. But precisely dialogue, not the foisting of one party's opinions on another. Unfortunately, events are developing in such a way that a number of independent-activity movements, the so-called Belorussian People's Front in particular, are attempting to turn our republic onto the path of separatism. Unfounded protests against the authorities both in the center and locally and against party personnel are taking place. Mass actions inflaming the atmosphere and disorienting people are being staged. We cannot fail to be disturbed by nationalist and chauvinist demonstrations.

Recently a number of currents within the CPSU also have been attempting to divert it, knock it from its chosen path, and demoralize it from within, if you will. Attacks are coming from both the right and the left. Specifically, this applies to certain forces of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" movement also. It is being manifested in our republic too. The newspapers have written in detail about the republic conference of this movement held in Minsk.

On a whole number of problems—the place and role of the party in society, attitude toward Article 6 of the USSR Constitution (in the previous wording, of course), the procedure for the election of steering bodies and the formation of their apparatus and certain others—the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the "Democratic Platform" are not in manifest, fundamental contradiction. However, there are in the latter propositions which a true communist cannot accept. And as far as I know, they are supported by far from everyone in the "Democratic Platform" movement itself even. We do not have the right to overlook these extreme viewpoints. The main differences concern not only theoretical propositions but also organizational issues. These include a demand for renunciation of the principle of democratic centralism and the territorial-production composition of the CPSU and the introduction of freedom for factions. The "radicals" of this movement have essentially embarked on the path of struggle against the party and its ideology and wish to turn the CPSU into a parliamentary party and from a political organization into an amateur association, condemning it ultimately to disorder and defeat.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] This phenomenon did not emerge just today. The ideas have been in the air, as they say, for a long time and were expressed at meetings of party clubs, the Minsk "Communists for Perestroyka" Club particularly. Why have the party authorities begun to talk about them in full voice only now? Are we once again late and marching in the wake of events?

[Sokolov] I would not say that we are late. We are for pluralism. For keen, but constructive criticism. And we were obliged to listen to the opinions of opponents, clarify their positions, and attempt in debate to find points in common and mutually acceptable solutions. Ultimately to attempt to persuade the comrades of the erroneousness of the ideas they propose. It was in this direction that our work was performed.

Now, however, when the "screen" concealing the true goals has been removed and when the "Democratic Platform" has begun to create its own organizational structures and is intent on having its postulates incorporated in the CPSU platform and, in the event of failure, heading in the direction of a split, the party must adopt decisive measures.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] The Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee to the Communists put the issue very squarely. It is essentially a question of dissociation and expulsion from the CPSU for those who adhere to antiparty positions. This process will evidently be very complex and painful. Folly could easily be

committed here. Is there sufficient political wisdom and honest scrupulousness? What criteria have been chosen for the demarcation?

[Sokolov] The criteria are well known. They are, primarily, Lenin's principles of party composition—which are reflected, incidentally, in the draft Central Committee Platform and the new CPSU Rules. They concern the organizational foundations of demarcation. The second "divide," if you will, are ideological positions. The Central Committee letter says plainly that we are at odds with extremist groups and those who would like to put the country on a capitalist track.

Dissociation is, truly, a distressing process. People's fates will be decided here, after all. I therefore believe that it should be conducted tactfully and punctiliously. And we should remember that this is primarily the concern of the communists themselves. It is their opinions which are determining here. Haste is entirely inappropriate here. However, this work should proceed in an exacting and responsible manner.

The critical mood in society and the party is growing rapidly. And it is very important here, I believe, to investigate what is behind the sharp, frequently ruthless speech of one individual or another. The position of a communist sincerely wishing to help his party emerge from the crisis and restructure itself more quickly? Or the latest pose of a "weather-vane" with a party card scoring "points" in attempts to discredit the CPSU and playing up to a variety of "liberals" and democrats? We have already come across instances of those who, having broken into party work for the sake of satisfying mercenary interests and having made a career, are now in a hurry not to miss their chance, playing the part of "weather-vane." The party has not justified their hopes of personal well-being for life and is ridding itself of the negative consequences of the command-administrative system, under whose conditions the living for these people was easy, and so it is now that they are darting to the side of their former ideological adversaries. On the off chance of once again finding themselves in the driving seat.

However, I am sure that they will not succeed in fooling the party and the people....

We are for the unity of the CPSU and will do everything to preserve it. But even for its sake it is impossible, impermissible to succumb to the pressure of these and such-like turncoats and liquidators of the party. The ideological argument has already gone as far as direct political struggle and, as Lenin's lessons testify, when a chance to overcome disagreements no longer remains, it is necessary to raise the question of dissociation. Unless we do this today, the accumulated problems could tomorrow intensify even more and lead to unpredictable results.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] Our party needs a consolidation of forces more now than ever. What is the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee doing for this? How should the party committees locally be acting, on what basis should they be opting for the cohesion of the communists?

[Sokolov] The basis for cohesion is our socialist choice. The vital interests and requirements of the people and work in the name of the renewal of society. The party is opposed to social injustice and man's exploitation of man in all its manifestations. This is the ideological basis which determines the communist nature of our party.

It is these concepts which should be the touchstone on which the communist may be tested. Canvassing, explanation of the policy of the CPSU Central Committee, and persuasion should be the party committees' main instrument in their work. It should be remembered that there are among the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" many communists who have evidently simply become confused and have been unable to grasp everything fully and understand the essence of their movement. They need our assistance.

I believe that for the cohesion of the party the primary organizations and committees are obliged to make full use of discussion of the draft Central Committee Platform for the 28th Congress and the CPSU Rules. It is important to enlist the communists in profound, concerned discussion about what kind of party it should be under current conditions and what its role in the restructuring processes should be. It is essential to remember here that there is by no means a change in the primordial nature and social and political purpose of the Lenin party with the change in the wording of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution. The main purpose of the restructuring of the CPSU amounts not only to not losing its vanguard role but, on the contrary, to making it a political reality effectively influencing all aspects of the life of society.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] Yefrem Yevseyevich, the CPSU Central Committee Letter was published on the eve of the impending elections of delegates to the party forum.

[Sokolov] Yes, and it is important to take this into consideration in the course of day-to-day work. We need to strive to ensure that the primary organizations strictly and consistently uphold the party line. If we wish the work of the party conferences and congresses to be fruitful, enterprising, and creative then people who are ideologically convinced and morally beyond reproach and who have a heightened sense of responsibility to the party, their people, and our socialist fatherland should be elected delegates. Of course, attempts will be made to distract the communists with high-sounding words or facile promises and bribes, behind which there is nothing other than personal ambitions. But I am sure also that our communists have sufficient common sense not to succumb to demagogues and bawlers. We need to send to the congress people who can knowledgeably tackle the most acute problems which have accumulated in the country and the republic.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] One of them, evidently, is the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Electric Power Station]. Work is still proceeding too slowly, and decisions which have been adopted are not being complied with at all in a number of places. The current opinion is that the adoption of the official Chernobyl program has in fact been blocked. Political intriguers are taking advantage of the tragedy of the Belorussian people for their own purposes.

[Sokolov] I know that there is criticism of the republic government and Communist Party Central Committee for slowness in the removal of the consequences of the accident. Yes, there is certainly point to it. However, there is much also which is slanderous and far-fetched and which does not correspond to the truth of reality and the facts. We all need today to unite efforts in the struggle against the common—I emphasize this—disaster.

I would note that in the very near future the USSR Supreme Soviet will discuss and adopt a special official program for the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. Studies in our republic will form the basis of this program. The maximum possible is being done to remove the consequences of the accident as quickly as possible.

Now, when we are wiser, as they say, and have gained bitter but essential experience in combating the appalling disaster, we will evaluate many of our former actions in that spring of 1986 differently. However, let us be frank, neither then at that dreadful time nor now has the country's science given us clear-cut unequivocal answers. In the first years we essentially operated gropingly, obtaining contradictory advice and lacking any specific data and scientific concepts. And the current concept even permitting an accumulation of radiation in the human organism of up to 35 rems over 70 years cannot satisfy us. The republic leadership emphatically disagrees with this. Our position is prompted by peasant wisdom: It is impossible to live where one cannot avail oneself of the products of one's yard. And we will strive for realization of this position.

The republic has incurred colossal material loss: Overall it constitutes—with regard for the decay of strontium, cesium, and plutonium—over R82 billion! It will take many years of persevering labor to make it up. Work is under way. The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government are constantly monitoring these questions. I want to be correctly understood: All of us—kolkhoz [collective farm] members, workers, leaders, the party secretary, the soviet official—all of us are hostages to a single calamity. And we can only overcome it all together.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] Today people are worried most not by theoretical arguments but the actual reality of our life, specifically the unbalanced state of the consumer market, everyday disorders, and so forth. This is evidently contributing to the increased attractiveness of populist slogans and every conceivable "radical" idea. What is being done in the republic to solve these urgent questions?

[Sokolov] Truly, it has not as yet been possible to ease the lack of balance on the consumer and intermediate product-raw material market. Inflationary processes have become more pronounced. Mismanagement and inadequate labor and production discipline are making themselves felt at a number of enterprises.

Unless these negative processes are halted, the hardest times await us. The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and Government understand this. Our efforts are for this reason geared to the social reorientation of the republic economy. There have been positive results. For the first time in many years the production of consumer goods has begun to outpace the growth of industry. In the four years the extent of housing construction grew by a factor of 1.2 and 1.9 million persons improved their housing conditions.

However, the addition of consumer goods to the store shelves is only growing slowly. Some economists believe that the solution needs to be sought in a transition to a rationing system. But it is true also that this could entail abuses, profiteering, and so forth. Others place their hopes in the introduction of our own currency. There are other opinions and versions also. They are all now being carefully studied, and the possible consequences are being forecast also.

The present year has become one of approbation of the mechanism of self-management and self-financing, and a concept of the republic's economic independence is being formulated. Despite the fact that market relations will be introduced in the Union as a whole, we in Belorussia intend to "take" them in a legal framework and be guided by instruments enacted by the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. This will prevent inflation being given absolutely "free rein" and a lowering of the working people's living standard.

[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA] As before, party and soviet officials of the republic are being rebuked for conservatism, bureaucratism, and a reluctance to renounce their privileges. What do you, Yefrem Yevseyevich, think about this?

[Sokolov] I will begin, perhaps, with privileges which are discussed at every fruitless mass meeting. I can tell you that the "order desk" in the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee has been abolished, as have the tailoring and shoe shops. The "Borovoye" and "Aksakovshchina" sanatoria, which belonged formerly to the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Health Fourth Main Administration, and also those in Miskhor and Nesvizh have been handed over for the recuperation of soldier-internationalists and inhabitants of the areas affected by the accident at the Chernobyl AES. The use of official

cars is being regulated: They will be made available in the main, aside from certain individuals, to officials on call.

As far as the first part of the question is concerned, I would say that the party and soviet machinery is, of course, in need of improvement. And this is being tackled currently during the discussion at party meetings, in the press, and on radio and television of the CPSU Central Committee documents for the 28th Congress.

The proposals of those who believe that the party apparatus needs to have not curators of the party organizations (or enterprises and sectors) but competent consultants on various issues, political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists merit support, I believe. They could, for example, study public opinion and on this basis help the party committees formulate the strategic line and tactics of actions in this situation or the other.

The new tasks demand new approaches. The search for them is actively under way in the Belorussian Communist Party. In uniting the people to solve vitally important questions, the party is uniting and strengthening itself.

Moldavian Resolution on Congress Date Published

WA2404190390 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 7 Mar 90 p 1

[Resolution of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee's 18th Plenum of 1 March 1990: "Convening of the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] 1. In alteration of the resolution of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee's 15th Plenum of 30 September 1989 to convene the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress on 17 May 1990.

To determine as the representation quota for the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress one delegate per 170 members of the CPSU.

For preparation of the 17th congress of the republic communist party to form an organizational committee (composition is published). To instruct the organizational committee to have prepared prior to 20 March this year a draft program of the renewal of the Moldavian Communist Party for the 17th congress and to have submitted it for examination by a plenum, having organized its subsequent discussion in the party organizations.

2. To consider of fundamental importance the election of delegates to the congress on the basis of direct, secret, and multiple-choice elections. To form a commission for the formulation of a new democratic mechanism of the shaping of the corps of delegates (composition is published). To instruct the commission to collate the opinions of the communists and party organizations of the republics on this issue and prepare prior to 20 March 1990 the corresponding proposals for examination by a Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

3. The reports and elections preceding the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress to be held within the following time frame: meetings in the primary party organizations in March-April, city and rayon party conferences, in April of this year.

To deem it expedient not, as a rule, to conduct elections of secretaries and party group organizers in primary and shop party organizations with less than 15 party members.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the gorkoms and raykoms to conduct the report and election campaign in an atmosphere of extensive glasnost and constructive, concerned discussion pertaining to the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress and to formulate a specific program of transformation of the activity of the party committees and organizations.

4. To recommend that the mass news media illustrate comprehensively and in depth the course of preparation for the 17th Communist Party Congress, objectively show the progress of the reports and elections and the atmosphere and the nature of the questions raised by the communists, and inform the republic population in detail of the decisions which are adopted and the realization of the critical remarks and proposals which are expressed.

Ivashko Reads Note From Works Party Secretary

90UN1321A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Feb 90 p 2

[From report on speeches at February 1990 Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko:

A note has been received. Its author, Comrade Anisimov, secretary of the "Zaporozhstal" Works Party Committee, insists that I read it out. I will.

"1. I propose that it be suggested to the government that it decide the question of the republic jurisdiction of all production subdivisions which are of all-union jurisdiction.

"2. That there be an analysis of how many unauthorized meetings have been conducted in the Ukraine and of who has flouted the law. Such an analysis should become systematic in the work of the republic structures responsible for the observance of legality.

"3. The plenum should make a political evaluation and express its position in respect of the illegal ouster of the party structures.

"4. Afford economic freedom to industrial enterprises, which are currently hostages to the diktat of the union ministries.

"5. The mass media—priority of the cult of labor and man-the-creator.

"6. Adopt a decision on the expression of one's position concerning the holding of reports and elections in the party before or after the congress. This is a matter of principle.

"7. To instruct the republic government to decide the question of the incorporation in the state commission of two to five percent of the product manufactured by industrial enterprises channeled into the agriculture of our oblasts."

These issues are very varied and extremely complex. They need to be separated, some passed on for examination to a commission, others, to the republic Council of Ministers.

Do you agree, Comrade Anisimov?

Ivashko Speaks at Donetsk Oblast Party Conference

90UN1723A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 10 Apr 90 pp 1, 2

[RATAU, RADYANSKA UKRAINA, and PRAVDA UKRAINY special correspondents' report: "When the Microphones Become Red Hot"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Dozens of people spoke at the conference—some from the platform, some from the floor. Some came up to the microphone several times. V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, took the floor repeatedly also. Concluding the debate, he said, inter alia:

You are the first in the republic to hold an oblast conference under the conditions of the extensive politicization of the masses, a real diversity of opinions, and complex processes of the renewal of the life of the party itself. It may be said with confidence that we have never before had such a report and election campaign as the present one. It is natural, therefore, that the attention of all the Ukraine's party organizations is turned to your conference.

The report and the delegates' speeches analyzed the current situation and made a number of proposals pertaining to a restructuring of party work and the surmounting of the crisis phenomena in both the political and socioeconomic spheres. And the conclusion which suggests itself is as follows: Despite the mistakes and miscalculations that have been made by the oblast's party committees and which have been pointed out here, the potential and creative possibilities of the Donetsk Oblast party organization are undoubtedly high on the scale of the republic and the country as a whole.

What needs to be done to commission this potential in full? It is necessary first of all, and almost all speakers mentioned this, to profoundly renovate all party life. How do we conceive of the activity of the oblast party organization after the conference?

It is necessary primarily to have a clear understanding of the ideological and organizational aspects of its work. These are the foundations on which the whole party stands.

The ideological foundations of the life and activity of our party are formulated in the draft Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and also in the draft program principles of the activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party adopted at the recent Central Committee plenum. It is a question of our fidelity to communist ideals and the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is a question of us seeing at the present transitional stage of society's development only the socialist path of development.

I would like in this connection to ask you, dear comrades, to analyze the work of the local party organizations and the party as a whole from the following viewpoint: Where do we see truly new approaches in work on the renewal of the party, which are being engendered among the communists and which are geared to the building of a new society, and where do we see that which is being persistently slipped in by our political opponents.

There is much criticism of both the CPSU Central Committee and the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Indeed, many mistakes have been made in this transitional period. But it would be wrong, I believe, although attempts are being made in every possible way to push us into this, to gauge yesterday by today's yardstick, which of course is entirely different from the viewpoint of the new experience that has been acquired. If we go this route, we will not be able to escape from the spiral of mutual recrimination, investigation, and explanation. Yet we need to go forward purposefully and rapidly.

To speak of the organizational foundations, the main thing for us here is fidelity to the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, the meaning of which under current conditions amounts to the maximum democratization of party life and a broadening of the rights of each party component, but at the same time unity and discipline in the accomplishment of the main, key tasks. Only then will this be a really efficient party. Improvement of the structure of the party authorities—from the Central Committee through the primary party organizations—is by no means precluded here. And the approaches could be the most diverse. But in all cases the main thing should be the profound substantiation of this work.

Let us think about the kind of tasks we are setting. The change in Article 6 of the USSR Constitution has placed us in the reality of a multiparty system. Can we now live

as we lived prior to this—under conditions of, I would say, political comfort? Of course not. After all, there are today even soviets of people's deputies in which there are practically no communists. Although Donetsk Oblast did not allow such a thing to happen, of course. But this is real life, and it has to be reckoned with. And we will have to struggle, enlisting the people on our side, by intelligence and constructivism primarily. We must daily confirm our party's vanguard role by our persevering work.

It is essential in transferring to a real multiparty system to think about the fate of the party as a single organism united by a common idea—given the broadest diversity of opinions, judgments, arguments, and debate, of course. And here also we will have to dissociate ourselves from those who are today members of our party, but who do not adhere to its ideological and organizational principles. There is no other solution, otherwise we will be blown up from within and will cease to exist as a political force.

Of course, we need to struggle for each individual in our party who today, perhaps, has simply not understood some things and who somewhere or other argues differently and adheres to a different viewpoint on this question or the other. But we must, I repeat, immediately dissociate ourselves from those who want to create any other party.

What should be the core of the oblast party organization's practical activity now? Much has been said about this from this platform, and precisely as we in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee understand it also. The pivot of our practical activity is and will remain socioeconomic policy. No one needs a political party that simply talks on this subject or the other. Nor are there in the world any such parties hardly. And let our political opponents not count on us abandoning the formulation and realization of socioeconomic policy, however much they might wish this.

What is the most distressing issue currently in our oblast? It is, as you know, the construction of housing and general amenities. The introduction of housing in the oblast had diminished compared with the preceding year in 1989, incidentally. What were the reasons for this? None. If there is talk of a shortage of material, it should be understood that these are the excuses of people who simply do not want to work. After all, only 18-22 percent of the resources you receive is spent on housing and general amenities. But if you received not 100 but 90 percent.... Could not 18-22 percent have been used in full on the construction of housing and general amenities? In addition, and I have to mention this yet again, although this instance was cited in Comrade Ye.V. Mironov's report also, there was a decline last year in the oblast in the manufacture of cement, construction brick, and precast ferroconcrete. It has already been said in the speeches here, comrades, that we are messing up the "Housing-2000" program. Can we not through the party committees rouse the Communists who work in the soviets and the economic authorities, rouse all people for its realization. It will be necessary for this, of course, not to lessen but to increase the production of building materials. This is, in my opinion, axiomatic. Is this not our policy? Is this not noble work, which we should be doing?

I would like to concentrate your attention also on questions of the development of enterprises of the coal and metallurgy sectors. Many critical remarks, including leveled at the republic and Union authorities, have been expressed in this connection here. Let's see, continuous management reforms have been under way in these sectors for many years. Last year the coal miners reorganized the structure here, in the Donbass. Let us ultimately plan, however, and think through in depth the kind of policy we should have today in the coal and metallurgical industry—sectors that have been neglected to a considerable extent and which are in need of big capital investments—and who should do this if not the oblast party organization? The same applies to questions of the development of the oblast's agroindustrial complex.

It needs to be understood also that perestroyka cannot be effected without a renewal of the entire spiritual sphere and a revival of the people's moral values. One of your students rightly observed at the all-Union student forum that we have recently been talking delightedly about the political role of the student youth. But do we have many real students today, those who are really studying? After all, in terms of educational level also we have lagged behind considerably.

Shaping and perseveringly implementing policy in all these spheres, we will be able to earn real authority among people. And we are called on to do this because there is currently simply no organizational force other than our party.

Now concerning the draft program principles of the activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party submitted following the Central Committee plenum for discussion by the communists and working people of the republic. It is a question, if you will, of us returning in a sense to the approaches formulated at the First Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress. At the time the founders of the Ukrainian Bolshevik Communist Party reached the conclusion of the need for the party's autonomization within the framework of a single Russian Communist Party, with subordination on program issues to congresses of the Russian Communist Party, and on general policy issues, to the Russian Communist Party Central Committee. The draft reflects sufficiently clearly, it seems to us, the main directions of our activity.

Now about the Ukrainian Communist Party Rules. The draft was discussed at the plenum and appraised positively, on the whole—with critical observations. At the same time doubt has arisen (as here, at the conference) as to whether we have any need of them at all. But is it sufficient that we would be guided by the CPSU Rules? Opinions have been divided. We did not assume the

responsibility of deciding this question; there are, after all, almost 3.3 million persons in the Ukrainian Communist Party. And the communists' opinion must necessarily be taken into consideration. After all, this is a fundamental and, to a certain extent, contradictory issue. And there should be no haste here. We need to reflect and consider everything for and against. And inasmuch as this document has been prepared, we will evidently decide this question conclusively at the next plenum.

In conclusion V.A. Ivashko observed that the conference of the Donetsk Oblast party organization had reflected to a considerable extent the diverse, profound processes which are occurring today both in the party and in society. For this reason it serves as a good starting point in the report and election campaign in the republic party organization and in the restructuring of all our work in the course of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress.

The conference approved the new composition of the obkom [oblast party committee] elected by party district and the members of the obkom control and auditing commission.

Ye.V. Mironov was elected obkom first secretary by secret ballot on a multiple-choice basis.

A plenum of the Donetsk Obkom examined organizational matters. As a result of a secret ballot P.N. Simonenko was elected second secretary, and V.A. Sergiyenko, V.P. Chuprun and Ye.I. Yukhno, secretaries. The editors of SOTSIALISTICHESKIY DONBASS and RADYANSKA DONECHCHINA were approved. Decisions were adopted on the procedure of the election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress, and on the formation of a commission for the election of delegates to the party congresses. [passage omitted]

Ivashko Tours Donetsk Oblast on Visit

90UN1723B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 2

[RATAU report: "In Donetsk Oblast"]

[Text] During his visit to Donetsk Oblast from 4 through 7 April this year V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, met with party officials, industrial enterprise and agricultural workers, and figures of science.

The talk at the meetings and in the conversations was of the progress of perestroyka in the republic, the role and place of the party under the new conditions and preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress. The particular responsibility of each communist at the current stage of the renewal of society was emphasized.

The party organization of the Mariupol "Azovstal" Works, which is rightly called a giant of national metallurgy, is the biggest in the oblast. The influence of the 5,000-plus detachment of communists here is tangibly reflected in decisions on both production and social-everyday matters. In the new electric steel-smelting shop, with whose startup steel production at the works has risen to 7 million tons a year, the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee chatted with the workers and answered their numerous questions concerning, specifically, economic reform, tax policy, and a fundamental improvement in health care, and inquired about the solution of environmental problems and the manufacture of consumer goods.

A modern animal husbandry complex for 12,000 head of young cattle has been installed on Volodarskiy Rayon's "Mariupolskiy" sovkhoz [state farm]. During V.A. Ivashko's meetings with the farm's stockbreeders mention was made of the significance of specialization in the solution of the Food Program, the need for an improvement in the conditions of the work and social life of the rural workers, and the regulation of the purchase prices of meat and dairy products, feed, and farm equipment.

V.A. Ivashko visited the Donetsk Kalinin Mine and went down to the face, where he acquainted himself first-hand with the miners' work conditions. In conversations with the miners and engineering-technical personnel the main attention was paid to the progress of fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Ordinance 608 and questions of the construction of housing and social and cultural facilities.

In the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences Industrial Economics Institute, the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee met with leading scientific associates and division and department leaders. Problems of the republic's economic sovereignty, the struggle against departmental preference and the creation of associations and concerns for the production of products of which people are in dire need were examined in the course of a concerned exchange of opinions. Ways to improve the environmental situation in the Donbass were discussed.

Resolution on Ukrainian Election of Delegates

90UN1676A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 1

["Resolution of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum on the Central Electoral Commission for Election of Delegates to the CPSU Congress and the Ukrainian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] To form the Central Electoral Commission for Election of Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress. To confirm the composition of the Commission.

The Central Electoral Commission for Election of Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress

Commission Chairman

Petr Prokofyevich Todorov, party committee secretary of the Kharkov Tractor Plant imeni S. Ordzhonikidze.

Deputy Commission Chairmen

Vladimir Mikhaylovich Orlov, head of the Party Structuring Department, Kiev Higher Party School.

Nina Vasilyevna Chernousko, deputy director of Mirnensk High School, Borispolskiy Rayon, Kiev Oblast.

Commission Secretary

Mikhail Vladimirovich Bernatskiy, deputy head of the Department for Organizational-Party Work and Personnel of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Commission Members

Vladimir Ulyanovich Antonyuk, party committee secretary of the "Kommunar" kolkhoz [collective farm], Starokonstantinovskiy Rayon, Khmelnitskiy Oblast.

Valentin Alekseyevich Gayvoronskiy, arc welder at the "Azovmash" Production Association, Donetsk Oblast.

Viktor Vasilyevich Lozovoy, mine tunneler at the Mine imeni 19th CPSU Congress, "Voroshilovgradugol" Production Association.

Nikolay Vladimirovich Miskov, first secretary of the Rokitnovskiy Raykom [rayon committee] of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Rovno Oblast.

Arkadiy Arkadyevich Naumenko, deputy chief of the political department of Kiev Military District.

Grigoriy Vladimirovich Ortynskiy, planer at the "Tochmash" Production Association, Odessa.

Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Pavlichenko, chairman of the kolkhoz imeni Dimitrov, Bershadskiy Rayon, Vinnitsa Oblast.

Nadezhda Petrovna Subota, deputy chairman of the "Progress" kolkhoz, Mankovskiy Rayon, Cherkassy Oblast.

Stepan Vladimirovich Tokarskiy, secretary of the Berezhanskiy Raykom of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Ternopol Oblast.

Vasiliy Ivanovich Folvarochnyy, executive secretary of the Chernovtsy Oblast organization of the Ukrainian Writers Union.

Ivan Vlasovich Khirnyy, chairman of the Zhitomir Oblast Union of War and Labor Veterans.

Anatoliy Timofeyevich Kholodkov, director of the "Kremniypolimer" Plant, Zaporozhye.

Dmitriy Mikhaylovich Khomich, first secretary of the Krivoy Rog Gorkom [city committee] of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Dnepropetrovsk Oblast.

Charges Filed in March Pro-Lithuania Rally

WA1405194990 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 3

[Report from the press center of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee: "Who Benefits by Confrontation?"]

[Text] Letters have been arriving at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee with questions regarding the socio-political situation which has arisen in the republic in connection with recent statements and actions of the leadership of the People's Movement of the Ukraine for perestroyka.

"How should we look at the fact," people ask, "that following the appeal of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee to Communists and all workers of the republic, and following the declaration of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Government, Rukh nonetheless conducted unsanctioned rallies for demonstrative effect in Kiev and a number of other cities on 31 March? What is this—the impotence of authority? And what are we to expect from this point on? Why should there be an appeal, a declaration, or even laws, if all these things are going to be ignored?"

The appeal of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and declaration of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers on the decision of the People's Movement of the Ukraine to organize rallies in support of recent decisions of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on "restoration of an independent Lithuanian state" should not be seen in oversimplified fashion as a ban. These were necessary to precisely attest to the position of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government, to effect their categorical dissociation from the decision of the Rukh leadership—an irresponsible, adventurist, and provocative measure supporting one portion of the Lithuanian population and showing disrespect to another, an action fanning the flames of interethnic strife.

These actions on the part of Rukh show a direct disregard for the resolution of the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, for ukases of the USSR President, and for the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government. Every individual can thus judge who it is who is professing such legal nihilism, who is sowing the seeds of lawlessness in society.

The events of 31 March and 1 April show that the working people of the Soviet Ukraine have made a correct political appraisal of the provocative appeals of Rukh leaders, and they are not allowing themselves to be dragged into irresponsible actions. Rallies did not take place in the overwhelming majority of oblasts; and in the

remainder, the numbers of people who gathered were significantly fewer than what organizers were counting on.

Only groups of adherents of such socio-political organizations as Rukh, the Ukrainian Christian Union, and the so-called Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth ignored the warning. According to data of law enforcement organs, about 35,000 people attended unsanctioned rallies across the republic.

A great many letters have arrived at republic and local newspaper offices expressing resolute condemnation of Rukh's audacious activities. Some of these are being published.

Numerous protests of people were elicited by the fact that deputies here and there acted as instigators—individuals in whom the people invested their high confidence and for whom legal nihilism is especially intolerable. USSR people's deputies D. Pavlychko and V. Yavorivskiy sounded appeals advocating "support of an independent Lithuania" in Kiev next to the Republic Stadium, along with recently elected Ukrainian SSR People's Deputy I. Dran. They used the rally as an opportunity to make a regular self-advertisement, and as justification before the people of their break with the party.

Impertinent disrespect for the law was shown by USSR People's Deputy V. Yavorivskiy. Opening an unsanctioned rally in Kiev, he praised those who had gathered there for "having endured yet another terror," having scorned the ban of the city soviet. What else but indignation can such behavior on the part of a representative of the highest legislative organ of the country evoke—permitting himself to disregard law and order, strict observance of which should be for him an immutable principle?

A. Shevchenko, just elected Ukrainian SSR people's deputy, also resorted to illegal—in essence anti-constitutional—activities. He called upon young people "not to take the oath," "not to serve in an army of occupation." It is difficult to imagine how this could be in keeping with the status of deputy.

Instigative statements resounded from the mouths of certain deputies at a rally in Lvov. Ukrainian SSR People's Deputy V. Chernovol stated "we are all occupied by the Bolsheviks and must demand independence. If necessary, the people of Lvov will resort to acts of civil disobedience..." M. Kosiv, Ukrainian SSR people's deputy and co-chairman of the local "Memorial," spoke of the possibility of forming detachments of Ukrainian volunteers and sending them to Lithuania.

Gang-style banners were hoisted at the rallies and slogans were shouted directed towards inflaming enmity and dissension. Hysterical cries of "Down With the Empire!" resounded, among others.

Among those attending the rallies there appeared people who were clearly provoking clashes with police, a fact which demonstrates their desire to promote conflict and discredit the organs of authority. This was especially manifest in the unsanctioned procession conducted 1 April in Kiev by the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth—aggressive conduct, premeditated obstruction of transportation, an attempt to replace the state flag with a yellow and blue one at the city soviet building... Aware that the use of force might comprise a response to such actions, and rightfully so, extremist elements resorted to an extremely base and shameful tactic—they drew children into the procession, essentially using them as protection.

The leaders and activists of Rukh, the Ukrainian Christian Union, and Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth, who say a great deal about democracy and human rights, displayed their lack of respect for the law and their low level of legal culture. People must see all this and know who they are dealing with, know what these "champions of democracy" are capable of doing.

With respect to the actions of law enforcement organs, on the whole they responded appropriately to the situation. After all, use of force is not an end in itself, but rather an extreme measure to be applied when it is necessary to protect peaceful people from violence, from disorganization of social life.

Thus, the matter at hand does not involve actions of force by police. It is important that violation of the law not go unpunished.

A press center representative went to the Ukrainian SSR Procuracy and the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and obtained the following information.

Charges have been filed against 50 individuals, and four people were issued warnings for organizing and conducting unsanctioned rallies on 31 March and 1 April, and for violating order as prescribed by law in the republic. In addition, materials concerning 58 deputies and seven candidates for deputy are being forwarded to appropriate soviets of people's deputies and electoral commissions for their examination. The community is justifiably awaiting a reaction based on principle—after all, it is those who themselves were sworn to insure supremacy of the law who violated it.

At the same time, the working people of the republic are expressing their surprise and dismay at the fact that rallies banned by the authority are taking place all the same. They believe this cannot be tolerated and are demanding that the efforts of law enforcement organs be coordinated with those of the community to ensure that the law is strictly observed—without which there can be no true democracy. Members of the community want the authority to stand up more forcefully in defending the rights and interests of the people, so that we see strict accountability being applied for extremist acts and the flaming of interethnic dissension, so that the requirements of the USSR law just recently passed "On

Increasing Accountability for Encroachments upon Equal Ethnic Rights of Citizens and for Forcible Violation of the Territorial Integrity of the USSR" are taken into account in their entirety.

Caucasus

Article Urges Formation of Transcaucasian Council

90US0765A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 16 Mar 90 pp 3-4

[Article by M. Yeligulashvili and E. Kakabadze: "A Transcaucasian Parliament—Means to Reach Accord"]

[Text] **Three white flags, eternal symbols of truce and parliamentary negotiations, have become the symbols of a search for ways to reach peace and accord in the Transcaucasus at a trilateral meeting of authorized representatives of political and social organizations of the three Transcaucasian republics. The National-Democratic Party of Georgia initiated and organized the meeting. The film studio "Gruziya-Film" offered its premises for the negotiations.**

It is still early to comment on specific results of this meeting—after all, it is just the first step, a trial measure for reaching accord. But we can already evaluate its significance.

We will not debate what measures are being undertaken by official circles to regulate the situation in the Transcaucasus, especially in the drawn out conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The fact of the matter is such efforts, if they are being applied, remain futile. We have already grown accustomed to today's objective reality: Forces which are still referred to out of habit as informals enjoy far greater prestige than those same "official circles." The attempt therefore to begin negotiations on that level, that of the leaders of informal organizations, is not simply very important—it also provides cause for significant optimism. In this regard we are talking not only about today's problems, but those of a much more long-term nature as well. At the center of attention of the meeting was the question of establishing a Transcaucasus coordinating council, a distinctive kind of Transcaucasian parliament of the variety which has already been created by the three Baltic republics. This is a truly serious effort and not just a passing phenomenon.

Prior to the start of the talks we spoke with Georgiy Chanturiya, chairman of the National-Democratic Party of Georgia, at whose initiative the negotiations were undertaken, in an attempt to determine their platform. This is what he said:

"At the Second Congress of the National-Democratic Party of Georgia, prior to the events in Baku, we adopted a resolution concerning this conflict. The Baku tragedy hastened our efforts: to create in the Transcaucasus something similar to the Baltic Council. Of course, we cannot be naive—contradictions will remain all the same, perhaps even with elements of confrontation, especially between Armenia and Azerbaijan. But we must get past this. It is vitally necessary that we be together—this is no whim. We have one goal—independence. And if we do not unite our efforts, nothing will come of it.

We believe that all problems (including the Karabakh situation) can be resolved through political methods and not bloodshed. In addition, we are convinced on the whole that any territorial claims today are unrealistic—such may be presented by one state to another, but not by one colony to another. Our draft agreement envisages that the resolution of all issues, including territorial ones, should be postponed until such time as independence is restored."

"How realistic, in your view, is the establishment of a coordinating council in light of today's conditions? After all, the contradictions between Armenia and Azerbaijan run very deep and religious considerations, it seems at least from a distance, are still so very heavily involved."

"The Christian religion, like any other, does not call upon people to resort to war and bloodshed. Azeri Muslim leaders and the religious leaders of Armenia have shown this in the current situation as well. What we see is profiteering on religious emotions. We recall how, for example, during the years of World War II when Stalin needed the church's assistance in order to influence people's religious feelings, there was a sudden rapprochement between him and Metropolitan Sergiy. This was not a sincere action, but politics.

And presently an attempt is being made to bring the religious factor to the fore in order to cover up the politics of the center. In fact, religion plays a role of little significance—just like the ethnic factor.

It is our task to convince everyone that our enemies are not Armenians, Azeris, Russians, etc. The enemy is the system, which is consciously pursuing the provocation of ethnic, religious, and other kinds of conflicts."

"A meeting was held not long ago in Riga similar to the one in Tbilisi. What is the difference between that and the present one?"

"The main difference is that the present meeting is a trilateral one—the Georgian party is not playing the role of mediator, but of equal-rights partner. Participating in the meeting from our republic, in addition to the National-Democratic Party, are the Christian-Democratic Alliance, the Democratic Party, the "Greens," and a number of other leading political organizations. From Armenia—the Organization for National Self-Determination, Alliance for Constitutional Rights, and other groups. From Azerbaijan—a most influential organization, the People's Front, and groups which have joined it as factions—the Student Alliance, Republican Party, Committee in Support of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and others.

And there is another, no less significant distinction. The Riga meeting took place spontaneously and, for this or other reasons, it practically fell apart.

Our preparations for this meeting have been far more serious. On 30 January a preliminary trilateral meeting was held at which we defined our positions in practical terms with respect to all significant issues. Thus the present meeting, fundamental and official, has a more formal nature."

Unfortunately, Chanturiya's optimism was not borne out in all aspects during the course of the meeting. The talks were conducted in a manner far from formal. Contradictions between Armenia and Azerbaijan are indeed exacerbated to the limit. Divergence in views on certain issues during the course of the meeting turned out to be so deep that they could not be overcome, and it would be difficult to expect their resolution in the near future. Thus, for example, the Armenian side was not satisfied with the proposal to postpone a decision on the Karabakh question until attainment of complete sovereignty. They insisted and continue to insist on its immediate consideration.

A number of other points evoked disagreement from the Azeri side.

The meeting was somewhat restricted in time. It happens that action is presently underway in Armenia in defense of the right of referendum and for adoption of status provisions for Armenian citizenship. And those who came to Tbilisi for the negotiations are among the organizers of this action. They had to return to Yerevan that very same day.

As a result, the decision was made to discuss the draft agreement in the republics and meet again in about two months to effect its adoption with appropriate corrections.

We believe our readers would be interested in seeing the draft agreement.

Draft Communique

Proceeding from the fact that the Azeri, Armenian, and Georgian national-liberation movements have a tremendous power, and that unification of these forces would have a qualitatively new effect, the political forces of the Transcaucasus believe it is vitally necessary to put an immediate end to interethnic quarrels in this region and direct all their efforts against the common enemy. In this regard, authorized representatives of political organizations from the Armenian and Azeri sides and the National-Democratic Party of Georgia conclude the following agreement:

1) The Azeri side recognizes the presence of fundamental dispute in the Karabakh question.

The Armenian side withdraws the Karabakh question from the agenda prior to the attainment of independence.

Both sides believe that the Karabakh question will have to be decided in the future with United Nations participation, without any force and using exclusively political means.

2) All sides denounce in the most resolute fashion pogrom, murder, the taking of hostages, any kind of violent activity. In the future, both sides must refrain from actions of violence against one another. In the event such activity takes place, the organizations which have signed this document will immediately communicate with each other, localize the conflict, and identify the guilty parties, regardless of their nationality.

3) The Georgian side obligates itself to always play the role of peaceful mediator between the two neighboring peoples and facilitate the attainment of peace in the Transcaucasus. In order to eradicate discord, unite our forces, and coordinate all our activities, it is necessary to establish the Coordinating Council of Political Organizations of the Transcaucasian peoples.

All three sides undertake the obligation of presenting their own drafts of program principles and of the Coordinating Council charter over the course of two months. The three sides will discuss the drafts at the next session in Tbilisi (probably the end of April 1990) and ratify, based on this, program principles and a Coordinating Council charter which are acceptable to all parties.

Grant Khachatryan, chairman of the Alliance of Constitutional Rights of Armenia:

This is already the second time we are sitting down at the negotiating table and attempting to talk in a calm environment. I think the Tbilisi session has been more productive. I spoke at it on behalf of my organization, the Alliance of Constitutional Rights. Although this is not a large organization, it has its own definite positions.

We like the idea of creating the Transcaucasus coordinating council which was proposed by the Georgian side. It is needed. The issue has been decided in point of fact—there remains only to declare it. The coordinating council is necessary in any event, even if war breaks out between Armenia and Azerbaijan. We must consolidate viable political forces. And we relegate a great role in this regard to the Georgian people, not as a neutral or interested party, but rather as a partner with equal rights in future processes.

Nariman Kasum-Zade, member of the People's Front of Azerbaijan:

As my first duty I wish to note that we are very pleased that Georgia has undertaken the noble mission of mediating between the two conflicting sides. As you know, the roots of the conflict have grown too deep; nonetheless, the time has come when, in spite of all the complexities, it is necessary to create a mechanism of resistance to continuing tension in this region. Proceeding from the presentations given at today's meeting from both the Georgian and Armenian sides, the conclusion can be

drawn that there exists an understanding of certain realities, although with certain divergences of position as well. Without comprehending the essence of the realities which have taken shape, we cannot proceed further towards declaring a moratorium on all territorial claims, since territorial claims provide a very convenient excuse for creating bastions of tension and inflicting blows to the democratic movement.

We are in favor of creating a common Transcaucasian home. The path to freedom and independence lies in consolidating our viable political forces. And the first step to achieving this, I believe, can be seen in today's Tbilisi meeting.

Georgian Communist Party Announces Personnel Changes

90US0811B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Appointments"]

[Text] **By a decision of the buro of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia the head of the ideological division of the Central Committee will be Comrade Givi Moiseyevich Talakvadze.**

Givi Moiseyevich Talkvadze, born in 1949, Georgian, has been a member of the CPSU since 1973, graduated from Tbilisi State University majoring in radiophysics, candidate of physical-mathematical sciences.

Having completed the university, in 1971 he was elected secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] committee of the physics department and then he worked as a junior scientific associate and assistant and deputy dean of this department, and in 1976-1977 he was secretary of the Komsomol committee of Tbilisi State University. Subsequently he worked as chief of the division of student youth of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol, and second secretary of the Tbilisi Komsomol gorkom [city committee].

Since 1980 G.M. Talakvadze has been engaged in party work. He was appointed deputy chief of the division of propaganda and agitation of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Communist Party of Georgia, and then he worked as the second secretary of the Ordzhonikidzevskiy party raykom [rayon committee] of the city of Tbilisi and the chief of the department of science and educational institutions of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Communist Party of Georgia. During 1986-1988 he was deputy minister education of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], deputy minister of education of the Georgian SSR, and then he returned to the apparatus of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Communist Party of Georgia. He was chief of its ideological division and recently—chief of the division of organizational and personnel work.

He is married and has two children.

By a decision of the buro of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, the new chief of the general department of the Central Committee is Comrade Tengiz Estatovich Abuladze.

Tengiz Estatovich Abuladze, born in 1953, Georgian, a member of the CPSU since 1975, completed Georgian Polytechnical Institute with an engineering mechanics major.

T.E. Abuladze began his labor activity in 1975 in the Tbiltabak Production Association. He worked here as a technologist, chief, and technical leader of the shop.

Subsequently he was a worker in the central plant laboratory of the Tbilisi Elektroapparat production association.

Since 1976 he has been engaged in Komsomol work: He was secretary of the Komsomol committee of the Tbilisi Light Industry Tekhnikum, an instructor of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Georgian Komsomol, and an instructor of the department of Komsomol organizations of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol. In 1978 he was elected first secretary of the Kirovsky raykom of the Tbilisi Komsomol and in 1980—secretary of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Georgian Komsomol.

During 1982-1983 he worked as chairman of the committee for youth organizations of Georgia and then as second secretary of the Ordzhonikidzevskiy raykom of the Communist Party of Georgia in Tbilisi. Since 1986 he has worked on the apparatus of the Tbilisi gorkom of the Communist Party of Georgia: He was chief of its division for propaganda and agitation, chief of the organizational division, chief of the division for organizational and personnel work, and recently he has been working as deputy chief of the division of organizational-party and personnel work of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia.

He is married and has three children....

Georgian Supreme Soviet on Protecting Sovereignty

90US0760B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 12 mar 90 p 3

[Resolution of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet "On Guarantees for Safeguarding the State Sovereignty of Georgia"]

[Text] While supporting the transformations taking place in the country, the further deepening of the course of democracy, specific steps along the path of expanding the republics' political and economic sovereignty, and creating a society based on common human humanitarian ideals, and at the same time having examined the draft USSR law on establishing the post of president of the USSR and on making the corresponding changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental law), the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet deems that:

—in accordance with Article 70 of the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) and the corresponding articles of the constitutions (fundamental laws) of the Union republics, the Union republics are sovereign states. Consequently, under conditions of presidential government of Georgia as a sovereign state, it should have its own president. The existence of the post of president of the USSR while there is no post of president of Georgia is a denial of the existence of Georgia as a sovereign state;

—Article 127(1) of the draft legislation also makes provision for a USSR president to be elected even if his nomination is rejected by a majority in a minority of the Union republics. This means that the president of the USSR, and consequently of Georgia as a state making up part of the USSR, may be a person who is unacceptable to Georgia;

—the USSR president should not be a guarantee for the exercise of Soviet citizens' rights and freedoms, because this obligation should be fulfilled by the head of the corresponding sovereign state—the Union republic;

—steps taken by the president to safeguard the territorial integrity of the country should not be limited to the right of a Union republic freely to secede from the USSR; this should be unambiguously formulated in the text of the law. Only a republic itself can be the guarantor of the safeguarding of the sovereignty of a republic. Realization of the principles of the national-state system for the USSR within the limits of a Union republic as a sovereign state is the exclusive right of the Union republic itself. As far as the relations of the Union republic with the Union is concerned, the president of the USSR should be a guarantor only for the impermissibility of infringement on the rights of a Union republic by the Union;

—since the Union republics are sovereign states, control over the regulation of relations between them may rest only with an organ made up of representatives of those republics as states. This right of a republic cannot be replaced by the right of the body of voters in that republic, in just the same way as a Union treaty as the regulator of rights regarding their relations cannot be replaced by a constitution adopted by the people's deputies;

—legislative enactments adopted by the president cannot have legal force throughout the territory of the USSR without the agreement of the Supreme Soviet of the corresponding Union republic;

—Article 127(3) Clause 16 of the draft legislation investing the USSR president not only with the right to declare war or an emergency situation but also the right to assume one-man presidential powers is unacceptable; this can be interpreted as the right of the president to dissolve the organs of power in the Union republics and totally liquidate a republic's sovereignty.

Without referring to the political position or personal qualities of possible candidates, the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet deems the draft legislation to establish the post of president of the USSR unacceptable, and the participation of deputies from Georgia in its adoption impermissible.

Confirming the conclusion of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission on matters pertaining to political and legal evaluation of the violation of the treaty concluded on 7 May 1920 between Georgia and the Soviet Union, the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet considers that the entry of troops of Soviet Russia into Georgia in February 1921 and the occupation of all its territory was from the legal standpoint interference (intervention) and occupation for the purpose of overthrowing the existing political system, and from the political standpoint virtually annexation; condemning the occupation and virtual annexation of Georgia by Soviet Russia as an international crime, it will strive to achieve the annulment of the consequences stemming from violation of the 7 May 1920 treaty and restoration of the rights of Georgia as recognized by Soviet Russian in that treaty.

The Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet proclaims unlawful and null and void the Union workers and peasants 21 May 1921 treaty between the Georgian SSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the 12 March 1922 Union treaty on the formation of the Federated Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the Transcaucasus.

Talks should be initiated on restoring the independent Georgian state, because the 30 December 1922 treaty on the formation of the USSR is unlawful with respect to Georgia.
[Signed] G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet.
[Signed] V. Kvaratskheliya, secretary of the Goergian Supreme Soviet.
Tbilisi 9 March 1990.

Georgian Journalist Union Declares Independence

90US0764B Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 23 Mar 90 p 2

[GRUZINFORM report: "A Congress of the Journalists of Georgia"]

[Text] **The Georgian Union of Journalists has become the free, independent, voluntary creative association of professional journalists. This decision was adopted unanimously by fully empowered representatives of the corps of journalists in the republic two years before the time set for convening a congress to define precisely its own place in the far from simple processes now taking place in Georgia, and to outline a concrete program for its own participation in the restoration of its state independence. This forum, the eighth according to the official chronology, was**

deemed by those present at the congress to be the first constituent congress of an independent creative Union of Georgian Journalists.

It can be said without exaggeration that this congress was not like any previous congress. The agenda itself predetermined the out-of-the-ordinary and sharp opinions, and the desire of each delegate to add his own two-cents worth to the formation of the new professional organization. The fruitful work of the congress was also helped by the fact that it was not, as in previous years, too organized and was not overloaded with a mass of formalities that set the teeth on edge. There was straight and candid talk, and the assessments and proposals made were dictated only by the interests of the matter in hand. The democratic nature of the congress was laid in the very procedure by which it was conducted. It did not start as usual with an accountability report from the board of the Georgian Union of Journalists but with a report from the chairman of the auditing commission. With respect to the former, it was circulated to delegates beforehand, and this enabled them to familiarize themselves with document presented and clearly formulate their own positions on the proposals and conclusions set forth in it. Incidentally, there was another innovation at this congress: The debates took place only after the election of the union board chairman. And this was not done by chance. For those taking part in the debates had to talk more about what the new union will be like and whether its board will operate as it has in the past. However, the short but pithy statement by board chairman N.G. Cherkezishvili included an analysis of both the strategy and tactics for future work.

Before moving on to the election of the chairman, the congress decided that in order for the union of journalists to be an independent and free creative union, its chairman should be freed from other duties. Three candidates were nominated for the post: N. Cherkezishvili, editor of the newspaper KOMMUNIST; A. Gogeliya, chairman of the Georgian State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting; and Z. Gomarteli, secretary for the Georgia Union of Journalists board. The latter two withdrew their nominations, providing convincing reasons for so doing.

Debates were held not only on the accountability reports of the board and the auditing commission but also on the draft charters for the Georgian Union of Journalists and a code of professional ethics for journalists. Those who spoke analyzed in a deep and comprehensive manner virtually every proposition in these fundamental documents. It was emphasized that journalism should assert itself, help to affirm common human moral values, and cover in an immediate and objective manner the activity of all parties, societies, organizations, and departments, and serve progress, humanism, and democracy. One subject of special discussion was the question of creating a mechanism to guarantee the proper functioning of a truly free and independent creative union and its interrelationship with similar creative unions and associations.

The congress adopted as a basis the draft charters and codes submitted, which will be published after the proposals and comments on them have been incorporated. Special approval was forthcoming for a provision in the code which states that if an instruction from the leadership of a publishing house or editorial office is at variance with the requirements of public morality or the provisions of the code a journalist should refuse to obey it. In this case he also has the right to refuse an editorial assignment in detail it contradicts his own ethical convictions.

The elections for the secretariat and board of the Georgian Union of Journalists then took place. Z. Gomarteli was elected board first secretary, and V. Abashidze and A. Sikharulidze were elected secretaries. The secretariat also includes representatives of the various associations of journalists in the republic. A professional ethics council and a council for journalists' rights were formed.